



**CITY OF RENO  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**



**April 6, 2001**

**THE RENO TRANSPORTATION RAIL ACCESS CORRIDOR**

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS/PROPOSALS  
FOR  
PROJECT MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT**

Minutes of Evaluation Committee Meeting  
FRIDAY, May 25, 2001

Reno City Council Chambers  
Reno City Hall  
490 S. Center Street  
Reno, Nevada

**PRESENT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF RENO:**

David Aiazzi, Council Member, Ward 5  
Sherrie Doyle, Council Member, Ward 4  
Dan Edgington, Stakeholder Representative, Fitzgeralds Casino Hotel  
John Hovanec, Union Pacific Railroad  
Todd Montgomery, Nevada Department of Transportation  
Greg Novak, Non-voting member, Federal Highway Administration  
David Rigdon, Council Member, Ward 2  
Dave Roundtree, Director of Public Works, Washoe County  
Steve Varela, Director of Public Works, City of Reno

Merri B. Traficanti, Deputy City Attorney  
Corey Boock, Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott  
Gary Stockhoff, Deputy Director of Public Works  
Greg Dennis, Sanitary Engineer

**DISCOVERY REPORTING**

935 Jones Street, Reno, Nevada 89504  
775/329-3500  
Reported by: STEPHANIE KOETTING, CCR #207

MS. DOYLE: We're going to call this meeting to order for the request for qualifications/proposal of Project Management Consultant Evaluation Committee for May 25th, 2001.

For the record, I'm Sherrie Doyle, Vice Mayor. That's why I get the choice seat of being up here to start us off on the ball. We are at this time still waiting for our federal evaluator, but we are ready for our teleconferencing and we will do that when we get to item seven if he's not physically here yet.

What I'd like to do first is go around the table, because we do have a court reporter back here tapping away. So for the record, if each one of us could identify ourselves and I will start with Mr. Edgington.

MR. EDGINGTON: Dan Edgington with the Fitzgerald's group downtown.

MR. AIAZZI: Dave Aiazzi, Reno City Council, Ward 5.

MR. HOVANICK: John Hovanick, Union Pacific Railroad.

MR. VARELA: Steve Varela, Public Works City of Reno.

MR. RIGDON: Dave Rigdon, City of Reno City Council.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Todd Montgomery, Nevada Department of Transportation.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Dave Roundtree, Washoe County Public Works.

MS. DOYLE: And don't forget to turn your mics on, gentlemen. Remember that not more than five mics can be on at one time. We will do now public comment. Public comment is to be limited to no more than three minutes and limited to items that do not appear on the agenda. Comments to be addressed to the committee as a whole. Mr. Fountain.

MR. FOUNTAIN: Thank you, Madam Vice Mayor.

MS. DOYLE: Good morning, Mr. Fountain.

MR. FOUNTAIN: John Fountain citizen who was illegally arrested here at city hall on 23 November, 1999 for exercising my constitutional right to criticize Griffin and Ghan. Question: How do we know that any issue ever brought to this table at any time has not already been decided in back room, secret meetings, which violate the letter and spirit of the open meeting law?

Thousands of words may be spoken about issues brought to this table, but if such issues have already been decided in back room, secret meetings, what transpires at this table is nothing less than fraud, hollow mockery of open, honest American government.

Window dressing democracy is a profound insult and an assault against our country's essence. Some council members and Mrs. Lynch may wish to go on record as stating that ensuring integrity of process has nothing to do with consideration of any issue brought to this table. However, integrity cannot be safely assumed when Griffin, Lynch, Aiazzi, Hascheff, Rigdon or Doyle are involved. All persons who are in any way involved in or effected by any issue or issues addressed here today have a fundamental American right to honest, open discussion in the context of the open meeting law. However, Griffin, Lynn and Ghan are proponents of back room, secret meetings which violate the letter and spirit of the open meeting law.

Not long ago, Judge James Hardesty ruled that subquorum serial meetings for the Reno Council behind closed doors were violations of the open meeting law.

Five current council members have participated in such meetings, Griffin, Hascheff, Aiazzi, Rigdon and Doyle. Our grossly incompetent city attorney Patricia Lynch saw nothing wrong with such illegal back room, secret meetings and permitted them.

When Hardesty ruled as he did, none of the named corrupt politicians apologized or demonstrated any remorse. In fact, they filed a challenge to Hardesty's ruling. Again, I ask, how do we know that any issue ever brought to this table at any time has not already been decided in back room, secret meetings, which violate the letter and spirit of the open meeting law and which violate Judge Hardesty's ruling?

MS. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Fountain.

One of the things this committee I've been asked by our staff, one of the things that we need to determine as we get further into the agenda, do you want to have public comment during the agenda item sections?

MR. EDGINGTON: I would say no.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Rigdon?

MR. RIGDON: My preference -- as far as when we're going over in the evaluation?

MS. DOYLE: As we go through items five through eight, if there's anybody that wants to submit -- .

MR. RIGDON: That's really for us to go through the evaluations. If we open it up, it would create presentations by the proposers. I don't want to do that.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. Mr. Roundtree?

MR. ROUNDTREE: I agree.

MS. DOYLE: Pretty much consensus? Okay. We will not be having public comment through the rest of the agenda items.

Nomination of chairperson?

MR. AIAZZI: I nominate Vice Mayor, Sherrie Doyle.

MS. DOYLE: Hey, thanks. Any other nominations? Motion and a second? All in favor?

Opposed?

Motion carries.

Thank you, gentlemen.

We will now go to number -- item four, introduction of legal advisors and reference reviewers. Merri?

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: Merri Belaustegui-Trafficanti, Deputy City Attorney. We have with us today Corey Boock from the law firm of Nossaman, Guthner, Knox and Elliott. He will be making a presentation this morning on how to approach your evaluation.

Also with us today is Mr. Greg Dennis and Mr. Gary Stockhoff, who are the reference reviewers, who will present a report to you. So I will turn the microphone over to Corey Boock, who will approach the podium.

MR. BOOCK: Good morning. Again, Corey Boock of Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott in Los Angeles.

I'm going to be doing three things right now. I'll be talking about the disclosures that you were all given and will be asked to make regarding conflicts or relationships with any of the proposers.

Second, talk about a brief explanation of what we're trying to achieve in this meeting this morning.

And, third, giving the results of the DBE pass/fail criterion associated with the proposals.

First, in terms of disclosure, you were all, along with your proposals, given a prior relationship and financial interest disclosure form.

What we were seeking with that, and let me for a moment describe what we mean by "relationship." We are not talking about whether you have a cousin or a good friend at one of the companies or the subcontractors of the proposers. We are talking about if you have a business relationship with any of these entities; you have worked for them, you are a subcontractor to them and on a given project or something along those lines. And, secondly, if you have a financial interest in one of those companies, shareholder, or some type of equity position.

We'll start with me, since as legal advisor I was required as well to make a disclosure, even though I am not an evaluator. My law firm has a relationships with four of entities comprising these proposers. The relationships are quite similar, and I'll just run down them real quick.

With respect to the Carter-Burgess team, my firm has worked with Carter-Burgess on engagements around the country, either as a subcontractor to them or pursuant to an engagement with a common client were working alongside Carter-Burgess. Recent work in that regard is the L.A. to Pasadena blue light extension and the Colorado Department of Transportation Southeast Corridor Project.

On the Sverdrup team, Boos Allan and Hamilton, ^exact ^ compact same relationship. We worked along with Boos Allan and as a subcontractor to Boos Allan. Recent work is the L.A. to Pasadena blue light extension, we're working alongside them. A subcontract relationship with the Hudson/Bergen light rail in New Jersey. And a subcontractor relationship with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Northern California.

Sverdrup civil, we also have a similar relationship. As a recent vintage, we have a subcontract relationship with Sverdrup from National Park Service in the Grand Canyon area.

Finally, on the Truckee Meadows team, we have work with DMJM on, again, similar relationship, including the Deactor project, the Alameda corridor we have worked alongside them.

I guess at this point, I would turn it over to the evaluators to make similar disclosures. And it's my understanding all these signed forms will be going to the City Clerk. I will come back after you've done that to talk about what we're going to be doing here this morning.

MS. DOYLE: Thank you, Corey. Anybody at the table who does not have one of these forms?

Mr. Aiazzi.

Okay. Disclosures, Mr. Edgington?

MR. EDGINGTON: I have no prior relationships.

MR. AIAZZI: Before I was on the city council, in my capacity as a computer consultant, I worked with Johnson Perkins and Associates; Wright, Warren and Schifmaucher. Because of the airport acquisitions, I've had dealings with Property Specialists, Incorporated and also Ledcor Industries through their work with the city.

MR. HOVANICK: Union Pacific has business relationships with several of the firms listed in the proposals, but they're used as consultants and on other various jobs that we do.

MR. VARELA: I personally don't have any relationship with these. As a representative of the City of Reno, we've done another consultant relationship similar to what UP with a number of the subconsultants on the firms.

MR. RIGDON: I don't have any personal relationship or financial interest with anybody in any of these proposals. I have, like Dave, worked with Ledcor in the past. They did the theater project for the city, but nothing recently.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I personally have no relationship with anyone that's been proposed; however, the department has a normal consultant relationship with several of the entity proposing.

MR. ROUNDTREE: I have no prior relationships with any of the proposers or financial interest.

MS. DOYLE: I have no prior relationship or financial interest in any of the proposers; however, being a member of the Reno City Council, as we have met and talked to probably everybody that's on this table, that includes, Ledcor, Sverdrup, Moffat Nichols and members of the Carter-Burgess team.

And if you are done with your forms, let's turn them in to Don Cook.

That was a piece of cake, Corey.

MR. BOOCK: Hopefully the rest of the meeting will work as easily. Okay. Turning, then, to what we're going to do here today. Please bear with me for a few minutes. I may sound a little simplistic up here. Think of it as kind of when you were taking the SATs in high school and they started with such things as sharpen your No. 2 pencil and fill in the oval.

So I'm going to run through what we're going to try to achieve during this time. Each of the evaluators should already have received the four proposals and reviewed them individually and come here today with the first column of their scoring sheets and scoring sheets entitled Individual Proposal Scoring Sheet Technical Evaluation.

The first column entitled Initial Technical Score should have been filled out by each of the individual evaluators. The scores for each of the evaluation criterion, which are the 24 or 25 items, should be no higher than the maximum point score in the column immediately to the left of the initial technical score column. No extra credit here. That's the maximum score. Do not go beyond that.

If the evaluator did not feel qualified to assess a particular evaluator criterion, they should put NA in that box. They should not put zero. Zero is counted as a zero. NA, that score does not count.

If you did put NA for a particular criterion, because you did not feel qualified, you should have put that for all of the proposers. So if criterion number four you did not feel qualified, you put NA on the Carter-Burgess proposal, you have to put NA on the other three as well for that same criterion.

One thing I want to point out in terms of the evaluations, make sure we're clear, is that this is not -- the scoring is not a zero sum gain. And by that, I mean, it is not, in the sense of if you harken back again to school, a curve, everyone can get As, everyone can get maximum scores. You don't have to give a gradation of scores on a particular evaluation criterion if all of them met a certain level. They can all be the same.

The rankings, ultimately, result from these scores, but on a criterion by criterion basis. You are not ranking them one against the other. You are simply scoring them.

Discussions will be held this morning with respect to each of the proposals. The order of the proposal discussions has nothing to do with how they are, you know, ranked before we got here. It simply has to do with what time they were received at the City Clerk's Office.

Before the formal discussions commence, the reference reviewers who are introduced will present their findings with respect to each proposal. The reference reviewers were asked

to follow up on the project references submitted by proposers and get some input from those references and former project owners. Following their report, that is when you will commence your discussions.

With each proposal being discussed, and you're going to take them one at a time, you're not going to go through the first criterion for all four. You're going to finish proposal number one before turning to proposal number two. The Chairperson will run the discussion.

Because of the number of evaluation criterion and the number of proposers we're dealing with and our limited time this morning, you can fashion your discussion anyway you see fit, but one suggestion might be to break down the discussion into the four major criterion.

By "major criterion," I'm talking about things like proposer and key personnel skill and experience being a major criterion. Where there are, you know, 12 or 13 particular criterion underneath that. You may want to talk through them in categories with each evaluator speaking as to a particular criterion if they see fit, but not necessarily touching on all of them.

You can also go through all of the evaluation criterion. It's really your choice, but be cognizant of the time. The discussion should be informal and evaluators should feel free to ask questions of other evaluators, make comments on their evaluation. This is supposed to be an informal and idea sharing process.

You may keep and make your own personal notes to assist you with your scoring after the session and then those notes can be retained by you. They do not need to be turned in.

Following discussions, you will complete the column of that same scoring sheet entitled Revised Technical Score Following Evaluation Committee Meetings. These scores will reflect any adjustments you want to make following the session today. You are not required to change any of your scores. If you feel that your initial score is accurate and reflective of your assessment of the proposal, you can just transfer them all, if nothing you've heard has changed your mind, good, bad or indifferent. Even if the scores are not changed, please do repeat the scores in that column. Do not just leave it as a blank.

Similarly, if you put NA in any score, because you did not feel qualified to assess that particular criterion, although we have some very talented people up here, you cannot become educated through our couple hour discussion and all of a sudden become qualified. So please put NA. You can do that right now. If you put NA on one, put NA in that other column. You cannot not all of a sudden score that one. You need to make a decision after the session as to when you're going to turn in your scoring sheets, whether it's at the end of the meeting or close of business or some other time. That will be a discussion and decision for all of you to make.

When your scoring sheets are completed, however, each evaluator must turn them into the Chairperson. The Chairperson and city staff will confirm that the scoring sheets have been properly filled out, and then they will transfer the individual scores for each criterion, which you put on to an aggregate scoring sheet, which will encapsulate all of your scores. They will be tabulated and we will identify the short list of teams that will be interviewed for the project manager consultant position. It's contemplated that list of short listed teams will be announced by close of business on Tuesday, but that's going to obviously depend on when you get your sheets in and when we go through the tabulations.

Couple last points. What this selection process is what's known in the industry as a QBS selection, qualifications-based selection. To the extent that any proposer put in any comments about rates that they will charge or fees, money that will be saved by using them,

commitments or anything like that on a financial basis, they are irrelevant for your discussions today and cannot be considered in your scoring. That is inconsistent with the federal procurement rules. It is qualifications only.

Finally, after you are done and you've turned in your sheets, you may retain the proposal binders until the interview sessions at which time you will ultimately turn them back in. But you may retain them following this meeting until the interviews.

Finally, before I take a seat and you all begin your exercise, in terms of the DBE scoring -- the DBE evaluation, on May 16th, a clarification request was sent by the city to all of the proposers regarding their use of -- or their planned use of DBE in this -- under this contract. All of the proposers did respond and after review, all have satisfied that pass/fail criterion. So they all can be evaluated this morning, and that is it.

MS. DOYLE: Thank you, Corey. So we don't have to do item five, I take it, which is --.

MR. BOOCK: That's right.

MR. RIGDON: Can I ask a question?

MS. DOYLE: Sure. Questions?

MR. RIGDON: You mentioned something about for this process we can't discuss any financial commitments or anything like that made. After this committee, then, makes a recommendation to the city council, is that the time when they can discuss those things?

MR. BOOCK: The decision even by the city council -- let's quickly walk through the steps you're going to be taking. After today, there will be interviews. This same committee will discuss those interviews, complete their scoring, will run through the tabulation and that will rank the teams.

The evaluation committee will make a recommendation to the city council based on the rankings. The city council will take that up and they will approve the recommendation to go and negotiate. It is not approving a contract at that time. And then you negotiate with the top ranked team and then that will go back to the council for ultimate approval, once a contract is negotiated.

MR. RIGDON: But when the council reviews the rankings of this committee, can the council at that time --.

MR. BOOCK: No. It is a qualification-based selection. So the council's thumbs up or thumbs down will only be when they say yes or no on the contract.

MR. RIGDON: So a firm's ability to provide certain guarantees or something, we can't -- .

MR. BOOCK: A firm's ability to provide, you know, we're going to save you this money or we'll charge you this rate at this stage -- .

MR. RIGDON: No, I was thinking, one of the proposals have in it a guarantee type of a thing.

MR. BOOCK: That cannot be considered during the proceedings today. And the council cannot consider it until such time as a contract is brought before the council to give a thumbs up or thumbs down.

MR. RIGDON: Okay.

MR. AIAZZI: Follow-up on that, as I understand it, the council has to take the recommendation of the number one from this committee, correct?

MR. BOOCK: It would be strongly advised that council take that recommendation.

MR. AIAZZI: And you talked about a short list. Is there a legal requirement as to how have to be on that short list.

MR. BOOCK: There is no legal requirement; however, our procurement documents, the RFP, which at this point then becomes the so called legal requirement, said there would be three short listed teams; however, if there's a de minimis scoring difference between the third and the fourth team, then the Chairperson has discretion to include a fourth team in the interviews.

MR. AIAZZI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DOYLE: Any other questions? Thank you, Corey. Report from reference reviewers. Mr. Stockhoff.

MR. STOCKHOFF: Gary Stockhoff, Deputy Director of Public Works over in engineering and traffic. Mr. Greg Dennis is here with me, Sanitary Engineer for Public Works.

We were tasked with calling references for each of the teams that are submitted RFPs. We basically identified I think the same four primaries to ask questions about to them, the design built procurement process or their experience in that, partnering, in public affairs, past experience of the firm and then their project manager and their assistant manager and their performance.

Mr. Dennis reviewed the DMJM Moffat Nichols team and the Ledcor/Atser team. And I reviewed Carter-Burgess and Sverdrup/Jacobs. So I'll let Greg go ahead and give his report on the two that he did and then I'll do the last two, and if there's any questions, we can go from there.

MR. DENNIS: Good morning, Greg Dennis, Public Works, City of Reno.

We looked at the -- in putting together some of our approach with this, we looked at the list of -- that you were going to have to fill out in terms of your criteria and do a broad-brush approach.

First, on Atser/Ledcor, those individuals that we did contact, I was able to get a hold of a David Bradley and he was in charge of the overseeing of the improvements in the international airport, George Bush International Airport. Atser had been doing basically QA/QC services for that facility. They were not involved, primarily, in the design/build of the project. They were not in any way dealing with the partnering aspects of it. And they had left to work for the contractor to do a QA/QC role for them.

He did also say that the work they were doing was quite adequate and they were continuing to do the QA/QC for the contractor.

I also contacted Wayne Nutt and he provided some other information on Atser and that he was much more positive and his responses were that they were doing specific items for those -- for those -- for Wayne Nutt and he's basically a different contractor. He's -- I forget the name of the firm that they were working with, but Atser is part of a bigger team and they were filling specific positions within that team and they were major contract administrators, resident engineers, various positions, about ten ^ 10 of them.

Their contract is not a design/build. It was strictly a typical bid design/build, not a typical construction project, where you design it and put it out to bid.

And they had no complaints on Aster's work at all. In fact, it was very good, the work that they did do.

I'll go on now to DMJM and Moffat/Nichols. I was able to contact -- oh, one more note on Atser. We did try to contact quite a few people and they weren't -- the list wasn't as big

as other folks like DMJM and Moffatt/Nichols had seemingly a lot larger scope of references that I could contact.

Okay. I did talk with Mahesh Sharma. And most of these people were upper managers. They weren't people that were down in the lower echelon of the work. And he was very satisfied with DMJM's ability to manage the projects. They'd been doing light rail out there and been going on for a number of different years. And they've put together a good working group.

He noted that they did have problems, like every contract, when they build something through cities and the like where they're building light rail systems. But he indicated that the groups worked together and it was a design/build project that they had worked on.

I talked with Al Moro, Port of Long Beach. Had a very long talk with him. He also -- we also talked about Mr. Kenegy, who is part of this team. And he had very positive remarks with regard to Mr. Kenegy's ability and how he had managed and followed through on specific parts of their whole process. They're doing, I believe, \$2 billion plus in improvements at that harbor. This harbor also connects with the Port of Los Angeles, which connects to the Alameda corridor, so there's a lot of activity going on down there and a lot of coordination among all the parties.

They are also going to renew and add five years to Moffatt/Nichols' contract for construction services. And they were very pleased to have them on board and that they were very positive about working with that group, too.

Moffatt/Nichols does a great deal of work with regards to ports and harbors. Moffatt/Nichols also has experience in design/build procurement, which I think is very critical to this group, because we're going to be looking at doing the same thing. And basically, he was very positive.

Dave Boger from Alameda County corridor, I did talk with him. He's basically one of the individuals on the oversight of the Alameda project and he also talked about Dwane Kenegy being familiar and how well they worked together with DMJM and the group.

They have a fairly extensive cost control system that we talked about. They have monthly meetings on their cost control systems. It's usually about a two and a half page document, double-sided that they go through, because they have, obviously, when you get to both sides of the projects and those kinds of complexities, you have hundreds of contracts and hundreds of things to take care of and keep track of. They have a financial program and they have a number of different pieces and parts that they use to put the whole program together.

And then Jim Van Epps. Gary did more talking with him, I think, but he's -- DMJM's also under contract with regards to the BART improvements to the San Francisco airport, which is also underground and a complex project, very complex.

MR. AIAZZI: Can I ask you what percentage that project is? Is it 50 percent complete, 10 percent complete, do you know?

MR. DENNIS: On the Alameda project?

MR. AIAZZI: On the BART extension.

MR. DENNIS: On the BART extension, I think that's just getting going. On the Alameda project, I think they're about 75 to 80 percent. And that they would be completing it this next year 2002.

With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

MS. DOYLE: Questions? I have two. When we do the short list and we're down to three or four, two, whatever, can it be if members of this committee would like you to call in regards to references on the ones that short listed, is that possible?

MR. DENNIS: Yes.

MS. DOYLE: Can we also suggest who we would want to contact with the references, like I notice through the pages that there was no references from the Puerto Rico project.

MR. DENNIS: You want references from that?

MS. DOYLE: That, and also there was no references from any of the public relations standpoint, community outreach, business stuff.

MR. DENNIS: We can try and drill down as far as we can with regards to getting that information, if you like.

MR. AIAZZI: If we get Puerto Rico, maybe that's something we get to do.

MS. DOYLE: Road trip. I notice that all four proposers have had people that have been involved in that project. It's a 30-mile tunnel. And I notice there's no references coming out from them, so it would be kind of nice to see what the four companies did and what their references are. But also the other key part that I see is just the community outreach, that type of thing, for references.

MR. DENNIS: Yes. And I did touch bases with the folks on Alameda on their community outreach. And one of the things that they have is a group that meets and has a response team with a required response time, and in terms of taking care of the public and meeting the public's needs. Because when you're knifing through a community, and you're doing different things like they did with the Alameda corridor, they were very sensitive about dealing with the public and the business impacts, because they're going right through business districts.

MS. DOYLE: When of the things I noticed out of the four proposals, and, yes, I read all four of them, is that three of the companies are going to be using outside PR firms and one company is going to be using local. And it would be kind of nice to know what their references are for both local and outside ones, if possible.

MR. DENNIS: More work on --.

MS. DOYLE: Public relations, working with government, working with businesses, working with RSCVA, that type of thing, what kind of outreach programs they had, if they were successful, did they manage to get open lines of communication, that type of stuff.

MR. DENNIS: I understand.

MS. DOYLE: Thank you. Mr. Rigdon.

MR. RIGDON: Just one real quick question. I reading through these, a lot of people are claiming references from the same projects. Obviously, they had individuals who were working for those projects who are now on their team or another team. In going through these and checking the references, did you notice any material misrepresentations or anything about claiming to have done work on a particular project that really wasn't work that their firm had done or anything along those lines?

MR. DENNIS: No, I didn't notice any major -- I didn't notice any conflicts or misrepresentations. Like Atser said they did, everybody's worked on the I15 project, the \$2 billion I15 project through -- in Utah. And Atser is doing QC/QC and they do a marvelous job of it. Just the things that you're looking for are -- we were trying to look specific things that we felt you would be looking for; the design/build, the management of the facilities and focused on those types of things.

MR. RIGDON: I just wanted to make sure nobody was claiming to do something that they hadn't done, that's all. And that answered it. Thanks.

MS. DOYLE: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. STOCKHOFF: Again, Gary Stockhoff. I did Carter-Burgess and Sverdrup/Jacobs and I will state before I get into this, that they had a number of references listed and I called lots of people. These are the only ones I got responses from. I'm not sure, it's just that they're on the East Coast and they decided they can't call Pacific time or whatever, but it may be something that we could follow-up on further if we get more numbers. And we didn't have many numbers to pick from with public relations or some of those other aspects that you may want us to go into later.

But with regard to Carter-Burgess, also Dave Boger from the Alameda corridor project. Again, there's separate contractors on there, so they were managing one of the overpasses on the north end of the project. He stated they were doing a good job with a very difficult contractor.

The project managers that they promised were the ones that had been supplied. And they have had a couple of changes, but they are doing quite well with who they have. They were not responsible, Carter-Burgess, for the design/build portion of the project or formation of that. They're not directly involved with public affairs or partnering either. I think he stated that they had one firm for the whole corridor project that did just public relations, public affairs.

The project is a little bit behind schedule because of utility conflicts that were not anticipated. Again, he had stated that that was not Carter-Burgess' issue, that was something that happened prior to that time. The project is within budget and he is satisfied with their performance on the job.

I talked to Mr. Boger about Charles Cowan, who is a subconsultant for partnering. I will state and it goes into -- there's another little statement here in the Sverdrup/Jacobs, Mr. Cowan comes highly recommended for the work he does with partnering. He was the partnering, major partnering person on the Alameda corridor and also the I15 project. And from everybody I talked to regarding his services on either of those projects, he is highly, highly recommended and has done a great job with doing that.

Mr. Boger considers Mr. Cowan an excellent facilitator and again recommends him highly. And that was all that had responded. I did get other project references, but did not get anybody that would call me back.

With Sverdrup/Jacobs, again, Charles Cowan and Associates highly recommended. That was backed up by John Bourne from UDOT who was the person that had dealt a little bit with Charles back there on the I15 project. And, again, he was highly recommended.

I also talked for Sverdrup Jacobs to Mr. Jim Van Epps on the BART extension project and this is for a subconsultant Booz-Allen. Booz-Allen was involved with public relations on this project. It is a design/build project. They are not responsible, Booz-Allen is, for any portion of the design/build process. He did state they are doing a good job on the public relations component and just their contract, Booz-Allen's consulting contract fee for that BART project is four and a half million dollars. So it is a substantial project.

Again, I have numerous, numerous project contracts on this one that had been listed in their RFP but could not secure anybody to return my call. So I'll answer any questions you may have.

MS. DOYLE: Questions. Just the same ones, Gary, that I had for Greg is because they also have people involved in the Puerto Rico project and also I15, I go back to the other three, I think two have -- so three total have some experience with the I15 project in Salt Lake and the community relations.

MR. STOCKHOFF: Right.

MS. DOYLE: Thanks, Gary.

MR. RIGDON: Same question I asked.

MR. STOCKHOFF: No, what I found is that these projects, that most of them are submitting for references are so huge that everybody has got a chunk and what they say they've done on those, they've done.

MS. DOYLE: Any other questions? Thanks, Gary.

MR. STOCKHOFF: Thanks.

MS. DOYLE: Don't go away too far. Merri.

MR. BOOCK: One thing I might point out, several questions came up about partnering and the community relations. All of these proposers, the leads, the main entities, they are design and engineering firms, by nature. They themselves do not typically do the partnering or the PR work. They have subcontractors on their teams and there actually were several that were common among each of them. So when the references reviewers were checking on those, you will not likely be hearing DMJM or Atser or anything as the entity that was doing the PR or the partnering. It will be someone on their team. I just want to point that out to the evaluators.

MS. DOYLE: So, Corey, even though they're mostly engineers and so fourth, one of the most important aspects of being a PMT is going to be the PR element, especially in this city.

MR. BOOCK: Absolutely. It is not a statement as to the -- that is not relevant or important, I just want to make clear that when we're talking about -- it sounds like most of the references reviewers talked about the primes, the major entities. And I just wanted to point out that those entities, that is normally what they do. They have subcontractors so when they report back to you in conjunction with the interviews, they'll be talking about a different company name that's on their team.

MS. DOYLE: We can request of personnel to call -- .

MR. BOOCK: The subcontractors.

MS. DOYLE: Yeah, the subcontractors. So we can do that at the end of the day?

MR. BOOCK: Correct.

MS. DOYLE: Can you also ask for like all four of them do not mention any of the apprentice programs, so we ask for them to -- .

MR. BOOCK: That would be something that we did not require any information on that with the RFP. So that is not something that is within the scope of your evaluation. The partnering and the PR was something included and that is fair game. But an apprentice program, is probably not something we can do with this RFP. That will also probably be something that will be very critical with your design/build contractor and that is something that will be included in that.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you, Corey. Any other questions, comments?

We are now at number seven and we still have no one here from FHA, so we'll take a quick break while we set up the teleconference. Five minutes.

(A short break was taken at this time.)

MS. DOYLE: We're going to reconvene this meeting. And, for the record, we have John Price on our teleconferencing. Mr. Price, are you with us.

MR. PRICE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. DOYLE: For the record, could you please identify yourself?

MR. PRICE: John Price Division Administrator for the Federal Highway Administration.

MS. DOYLE: Good morning, Mr. Price, and welcome to Reno this morning.

MR. PRICE: Thank, you.

MS. DOYLE: And for the record, ladies and gentlemen, we now have the FHWA. Present and we can proceed. Item seven, discussion and evaluation of the submitted proposals using the overall criteria described in the Proposal Evaluation Procedure Manual and, as needed, with the assistance of the reference reviewers and the legal advisors. Staff.

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: We're missing one.

MS. DOYLE: Who are we missing?

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: Mr. Aiazzi.

MS. DOYLE: Yes, I know.

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: Let me see if I can find him.

MS. DOYLE: So, Mr. Price, where are you calling from?

MR. PRICE: I'm in Carson City.

MS. DOYLE: Not too far away. We are now waiting for Mr. Aiazzi.

I guess we cannot run meetings unless all of us are present. Sorry, Dave, I did not know, until there was a panic.

MR. AIAZZI: I could have saved all this trouble by not showing up today.

MS. DOYLE: Then we would have had to appoint somebody. Mr. Aiazzi, we have John Price from the federal highways. He's identified himself for the record and it's also been stated that the FHWA is now item seven.

MR. BOOCK: The first proposal to be taken is the Sverdrup proposal.

MS. DOYLE: And that would be proposer number one.

MR. VARELA: Anyone going to start today? I'd like to state there are a number of different requirements, skill and experience of the folks on the job or in a firm, and with regards to specifically the design/build project. And in general, looking at the background and involvement in design/build, both as a contractor and an engineer type of thing, they have extensive experience, overall, and some of the individuals have specific experience on design/build.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: Thought this was also a professional group. The work that they've done looks very impressive to me. I should also disclose, I did when I was with the League of Cities in Boston, I did work with Sverdrup. They did show us some of their projects there. I will disclose that. But I thought many of the projects that they had done had been -- have been design/build, which I think is a real big plus. I was very impressed with their presentation.

MR. RIGDON: I'll jump in here, too. I was with Dave on that same trip to Boston. But in reading through this, the thing that stood out was all the rail experience. It's not just design/<sup>13</sup>billed ^ build, but specifically rail experience which is one of the criteria we had out there under number four, which was dealing with railway, the line work and track work and that type of thing and they seemed to specialize in that. I assume we'll go through and just

review in each four points for skill and experience. They scored really high with me on all of the categories.

MR. VARELA: I noticed also on their experience with regards to public affairs, they talked about a number of projects and coordinated PR programs through the specific names that I saw in there. And also had some individual that had certain experience with dealing with PR. And the partnering background is very strong, too.

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: I just might remind you to speak up, because the court reporter is recording this. I know it's not a usual format for all of you. I thought I'd gently remind you. Thank you.

MR. RIGDON: I was impressed with the public affairs part. But one thing I would have liked to have known is if any of these projects were as controversial as the one we're looking at now. And within the local community and how they overcame that. And they're not the only one to address that. That would have been helpful. So I knocked them a couple of points for that.

But other than that, they looked pretty good.

MR. HOVANICK: I think one of the things that will be helpful for success in this project is put together a good team. They appeared to have a pretty good team here with a lot of knowledge and ability here and I think that's going to go a long way in helping the project.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Edgington?

MR. EDGINGTON: I agree with what's been said so far. They've done a fine job and I noticed that they're a company founded on design/build and I was really impressed with the way they put it together, and their resume was just great.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Roundtree?

MR. ROUNDTREE: I agree. I think they really pointed out the design/build experience they had. And one of the things that they mentioned as well in the proposal is their approach to conflict resolution and relying heavily on the partnering, which occurs up front and the fact that they have Mr. Cowan listed as their subconsultant in partnering and he in the reference checks received high marks. So I think that's a significant element.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I, too, felt they were a very strong team, felt they had good railroad experience, considering some of the criteria that's listed here. It's important to the city, I think they meet that criteria pretty well. At least our function here today is to short list these groups, I think it should be considered as a short listed group.

MR. VARELA: One of the things that you notice when you read through these is how well they put something together and they were very well organized. And one of the requirements has to do with working in the constrained environment, however, as well as they did organize this thing, I didn't see anything related specifically to a similar environment to the downtown and I did on some of the others and I wanted to bring that out.

MR. PRICE: Madam Chairman?

MS. DOYLE: Yes.

MR. PRICE: Greg Novak is present in my office. Can I transfer the call and have him participate in the meeting?

MS. DOYLE: Not a problem.

MR. NOVAK: Hello.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Novak. Welcome aboard, Mr. Novak. Have you heard any -- we have just started on our first proposal, which is Sverdrup. And, for the record, could you please identify yourself?

MR. NOVAK: I'm Greg Novak, Operation Engineer with federal highways.

MS. DOYLE: We actually have a chair here for you.

MR. NOVAK: I know.

MS. DOYLE: Welcome aboard. Mr. Price has left the building and we now have Mr. Novak from the Federal Highway Administration.

MR. RIGDON: The one that I was thinking about when we were going through all these proposals was the organization of the proposals themselves is a reflection of the company. There's the one criteria number eight about the QA/QC for the project, and I was also looking at what was the QA for proposals if they presented the proposal that had a bunch of grammatical errors and those types of things and didn't really meet the -- speak to the criteria, to me how are they going to deal with it in the field when they have to go out there and prepare documents and those types of things. And from that standpoint -- so this one, to me was, like Steve said, it was very well prepared and I didn't find any real mistakes.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I tend to agree with that. That's certainly in my experience of review, that's something, a good point to be made. And also in terms of oral interviews is also a good opportunity to see a firm get up and speak and how they deal with the public, which I understand is a critical issue here. That's also a good opportunity to evaluate a firm at that time, how they prepare themselves during the oral interview as well.

MS. DOYLE: Steve?

MR. VARELA: Pretty well finished discussions.

MS. DOYLE: As far as this is an eligible company, and for the record I did not go to Boston, although I did see the subway in Maryland, the one that goes under the John's Hopkins outline. They scored very high with me on the personnel skills and experience, where for me they got a little bit knocked down was in the areas of location, knowledge of local, physical and environmental, political conditions.

Number two, some of it is pretty much dealing with where I didn't feel comfortable with theirs was the public affairs, relationship, sensitivity with working with a wide variety of governmental officials. To me, because this project is highly sensitive, the sensitivity was kind of missing here and it was not a major thought to me. To me, it is kind of a major part of this project.

Other than that, though, the other stuff, with partnering and design/<sup>15</sup>billed ^ build and everything else, they did extremely well.

Mr. Varela, do we wait or do you want us --.

MR. VARELA: I think we just consider our scores, that's what it is, and we can do it now or after the meeting and go on to the next category or approach to work task.

MR. RIGDON: Our total score or individual one?

MS. DOYLE: Revised technical score.

MR. VARELA: If you want to revise the score, you can carry it out, that's what the discussion is for is to give ideas and thoughts and if anyone had any -- .

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi.

MR. AIAZZI: One thing we do is make that decision now is are we going to turn in these forms at the end of the meeting or end of the business today.

MS. DOYLE: What would you like to do?

MR. AIAZZI: I quite frankly I wouldn't mind taking this and drive it up to the top of a mountain and thinking about it for a while.

MS. DOYLE: How late was -- .

MR. AIAZZI: It's really, really important.

MS. DOYLE: Would the rest of you like to turn it in by the end of the business day?

MR. EDGINGTON: Sure.

MR. AIAZZI: Doesn't preclude that you can't turn it in whenever.

MR. HOVANICK: For me it will be at the end of the meeting, because I will have a flight back this evening, this afternoon.

MS. DOYLE: Is a 4:30 deadline good for you?

MR. AIAZZI: Yes.

MS. DOYLE: To be turned in no later than 4:30. And those of you who would like to go on.

MR. VARELA: We have to discuss the work task.

MR. BOOCK: It may be helpful for the evaluators as you talk about each major category if for a minute look at the subcriterion real quickly on the scoring sheets and talk about the major category and what you just talked about is the proposer and key personnel skill and experience and Steve just indicated you're now talking to the approach to the work tasks and those criterion underneath that.

MR. VARELA: As a general comment, there's a number of ways of approaching projects. There's a typical way of approaching projects, which is normal construction project. Maybe if you don't have a lot of issues there's a general approach, and a technical, and that's textbook. And you can see it in some of the proposals and some of them actually looked at the uniqueness of this particular project and presented some views and approaches to that particular kind of thing.

And that was what I was looking for. And I generally went through this. And so that's sort of what I was looking at. I think Sverdrup did a good job in identifying some of the key elements, the critical activities of the project and it took an approach towards those particular things and the key elements that needed to be approached during the project. So they did a good job overall in identifying those and then trying to address those.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: I was very impressed with particularly this diagram here that already is laid out what their proposal is as far as what they think is a city task and what would be a project management task.

Also, I think they had some perspectives that they put in here that they weren't afraid to put in there, that somebody might still, discussing the owner controlled insurance program and some things that we really have to think about, whether we pick them or not, I think it's useful to us. I think that was very good of them to put those things in. Didn't seem to be holding anything back.

Here's what we'd like to do, and here's what we think is some of your challenges. Even if we don't pick them up, we can use these things. That ranked them up higher. If they are going to be up front with us now, they would be up front later.

MR. HOVANICK: I was impressed with the organization. The flow chart helps put it in perspective and see how the approach flows through the process.

MR. RIGDON: I agree with everything you just said, especially with Steve. Steve said in going through these, I was looking for real detail on how you're going to approach the task.

There's two things that particularly stood out for me. One was I really like the idea of the peer review team. That whole concept with people from the university and using that

peer review team to dispute resolutions and that type of thing, that stood out to me as an innovative idea.

And then the part where the first, they start off is get the entire team together and go all out, hole up for two or three days and put together the project, you know, a business plan for the project, which we do that every year and that's -- that was a particularly interesting. I agree with everything you said. The organization of that flow chart was excellent. I give them very high marks on this particular aspect because of the detail.

MS. DOYLE: Any other comments?

MR. VARELA: I wanted to mention some other things. I did find a little bit of -- it was hard in their discussion of the overall approach to problem solving, they didn't focus on safety issues, general public safety issues. I thought that was a little problem area. And also the overall approach, continuing the integrity and safety of the UP, they know a lot of railroads and they get a high mark in that regard to me. I mentioned that because I know some of the others had different levels of approaches.

MR. RIGDON: One of the thing that I did take off a couple of points for was the number 20, the approach to parking -- not parking, 21, the public affairs public information task. I think they did a pretty good job outlining that.

But one of the things I did not see in any of the proposals, everybody seemed to tell us what they think the benefit of the project were, and they would convince the public of what those benefits are, rather than trying to find out from the public what are their concerns and then tailoring the program to meet that. It's just the way they approach it is all. And I would have liked to have seen something listed in that outreach program. So we're going to go out and first, you know, whether it's through some survey technique or something like find out what's on the top of people's mind for the project before we develop and say, this is what we should focus on.

MR. EDGINGTON: Some of the things that impressed me was misallocation of funding before they happen and that was great. This issue with escalation, resolution of problems, I really like that. And over the shoulder design concept where contract design work together on the problems and solve it up front.

As far as 21, I did like the feedback section. I think that was good in understanding, maybe gain the community behind them.

MR. MONTGOMERY: One of the things I also liked was the talk down approach in terms of getting buy off from senior management on the group in terms of the partnering plan. I think that's critical in terms of getting buy off from the top down.

Also, on number 15, in terms of criteria, I felt strongly about the critical path approach and actually managing the project by using critical paths, making sure that work can be done on parallel in order to stay on schedule and truly managing and controlling the project.

MS. DOYLE: One of the things I noticed in here is that they concentrate on things on lessons learned. So I have a feeling if they were chosen they won't make the same mistakes twice.

One of the things that I'd like, Mr. Edgington actually touched on it, was the risk management, the risk team that they're going to do, which is risk allocation workshop immediately after the mobilization.

The other thing is that I liked that they also, the partnering process would establish a dispute resolution ladder. I thought that was kind of interesting.

But the only things, once again, that I scored them a little bit lower on is, once again, with the public affairs, public information tasks, not real strong, but, yes, I know they're an engineering company. So we won't do it too badly, but that was one of the low things that I did put.

Next one. Understanding. Knowledge and understanding of the ReTRAC project.

MR. RIGDON: The way I looked at this one, was kind of an overall overview type of thing. It didn't get into individual specifics and I thought it was an overview of the entire understanding of the project. They have a great understanding of the project. I mean, it's evident in everything that we put in the proposal that they've obviously been, and we know they have been watching the whole process all the way through and they are very familiar with what they're going to have to do here.

MS. DOYLE: Now, Steve, just for clarification on this issue, on page five of our sheets, it says maximum points scored 200, it's got a little footnote of four, total points available for this criterion is 20.

MR. VARELA: You divide by ten.

MR. BOOCK: Let me perhaps explain that. There's a total of a hundred points and you have many criterion, so to make it easier for the evaluators instead of having some criterion, have 2.5 points, we kind of brought it up by the quantity of  $10^{18}$  to make it even numbers, and then we'll back it back down at the end by dividing by 10 to get you back to the hundred points.

MS. DOYLE: So the initial technical score should be anywhere from zero to 200?

MR. BOOCK: No. It will be, actually, there's a thousand points that are down here, which will ultimately back down divided by 10 and end up on a basis of 100.

MR. VARELA: For that category there's a total of 20 out of 100. It's 20 percent of the total score.

MR. BOOCK: But, again, on the scoring sheet for when you write your score both when you did the initial and then after this meeting when you put in a revised you're doing it on the basis of 200 points for this category. The tabulation will deal with that. That is not for the individual evaluators to concern themselves with.

MR. AIAZZI: While we're on this, just explain this to everybody, we also, high and low gets thrown out and the average is taken?

MR. BOOCK: That is correct. For each particular criterion to ensure kind of an even approach to the scoring, the highs and the lows of each particular criterion get thrown out and then --.

MR. AIAZZI: The average of the other --.

MR. BOOCK: The average of the other six or if someone put NA, less than six.

MR. AIAZZI: NA is not considered a score.

MR. BOOCK: NA is not considered, and that's why as opposed to a zero, which is considered as a zero.

MR. VARELA: Going back to the discussion, on this particular one, they did a good job in summarizing what they represented before on the other aspects, so we could see.

And one of the things that they brought back up was that among the other stakeholder issues and all that kind of stuff, they brought up the issue of controlling cross creep. And that's a very important part of the job. So they have a very good idea of that kind of concept.

And, again, emphasizing safety and working with UP and working together on the fast tracking design issues, because of the issues with UP and so forth. So they summarized it very well and you were able to capture the overall concept.

MR. HOVANICK: I would agree that I thought this section here did a very good job of summarizing and recapping their approach. And, overall, I just like the way it was put together.

MS. DOYLE: Any other comments?

Last page, number six, knowledge of project specific conditions.

To make life easier, we'll just start down with Mr. Roundtree and just go around the table.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Well, again, this, for me, anyway, I think they demonstrated a good knowledge of the project. They've had similar experience with the conditions that I think they will experience here and I think they pointed that out pretty adequately.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I don't have anything new to add. I think they did a real good job in terms of making -- in terms of their knowledge of the specific sites we're going to be encountering in this project. At one point I've dealt with them on other projects, maybe not all of those together on one project, but I felt they have demonstrated they have dealt with one of those type of aspects on similar projects.

MR. RIGDON: I would ditto both of those remarks. I especially like the part in the proposal where they dealt with -- was talking about some of the similar soil conditions that they had worked in before, some of those types of things, because that's been a big thing that's come up at some of our -- with regard to this project. And so I thought it was -- I thought they really knew what they were talking about.

MR. VARELA: Overall, project knowledge sounded good. I don't think they stressed enough the research they could have done on the specific geotechnical conditions of our site. I know they have experience in that area, but they didn't really talk about the technical complications that could arise as far as local project knowledge experience. I'm saying that now, because I think some of the others did a better job on that.

MR. RIGDON: Just to comment on that, Steve. I would agree with you a little bit. But I did like their idea, I believe it was -- I hope I'm not mixing up proposals now. But the idea of digging the hundred foot section under one of the ramps first, so they know -- so that they can experiment around with different stuff. I thought that was a neat approach to it, too. So that kind of made up for me the fact that they didn't get into some of the other proposers did, so -- .

MR. HOVANICK: I think they showed good understanding of the requirements and put together a substantial team to deal with those.

MR. AIAZZI: I like them.

MR. EDGINGTON: I think they've done a fine job. You know, they bring up such issues as communication and trust and I like to see that.

MS. DOYLE: Ditto.

On to number two?

We will say farewell to Sverdrup for now. We will move on to proposer number two, which is DMJM Harris and Moffat/Nichols.

MR. BOOCK: That is the Truckee Meadows ReTRAC team, which it is composed of DMJM and all those.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. Submitted by the Truckee Meadows ReTRAC Team, a joint venture of DMJM, Harris and Moffat/Nichols. Got it.

Steve, would you like to start us out?

MR. VARELA: Sure. Obviously, there's particular project experience in closely related project as Alameda corridor project, very similar project. And they've been the project management firm with the -- some of the same individuals working on it as in the Alameda corridor. Plus they have a number of other experiences that are related to the project. I believe their background and experience is just ideally suited for a project of our nature that we have in the City of Reno, they demonstrate their skills and their abilities to do a project like this very well.

I was a little bit disappointed in their demonstrating their skills and saying up in partnering, I thought Sverdrup was much stronger in partnering. That was a weak point, the partnering, at least what they are showed in their proposal.

MS. DOYLE: Charlie?

MR. HOVANICK: I thought they did address the issues again and put together another good team. There's, you know, a lot of different firms that do this type of work and they brought together a team that looks like it can handle the work.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: I was, on this particular section, they brought in some things that I thought was important about the landscaping. They talked about the lessons learned. Obviously, they have some experience with Alameda, which is, I think, not only brings some experience, but experience that happened right away. In fact, they made a mention that they could bring the lessons learned from Alameda directly here.

I thought that they have a lot of experience in design/^20billed ^ build. And what I also like is their section 1.1 was the first goal is to immediately prepare and independent cost review, which is what we had asked for, to make sure that our cost estimates are where we believe them to be.

And they also brought out the Nolte team that they'd have to be working with, that that was going to be a concern. So they brought up the concerns that we have had and they said they've done that.

The part they've done with Alameda and the other projects where they said they've brought them in at cost or below cost I thought, obviously, is impressive. If they weren't impressive, they probably wouldn't stick them in this presentation.

But they also brought up the things about the Amtrac station and historic preservation that also needs to happen in this area. And the Baltimore Metro Rail, that's where they brought in about the conditions that they expect to meet here in Reno. And for some reason, I liked just the fact they used the term "utility hell." That's what I've got to say.

MR. EDGINGTON: I agree this is also another fine proposal here. They've got a lot of good people. They pointed out that the Alameda had six miles of high groundwater, which I didn't see anywhere else. And it's good to note they got that experience.

And their project management, they've used the term "full-time hands-on," that sounds good to me.

Also, they seem to be user friendly. They point out things that we have problems with like the skybridge downtown, and the garage and the Regency Sky Way. They've addressed these issues already or they're talking about them in here, and I feel that's good, because I

feel these people are trying to make sure survival is done there, that we don't kill the patient here while putting a new heart in.

I just felt that over all they've got a fine team and they've already done some of the work. They're a head up due to the fact that some of these people have done EIS study or part of it, which is also a plus in my mind. And they seem to have done a lot of railroad work and they've done work with the Union Pacific and other railroads.

MR. AIAZZI: One thing I wanted to mention, I was happy and impressed they brought in Jerry Hall also, who has done a great job with RTC. I think he brings in public management skills and also some professional expertise.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Roundtree?

MR. ROUNDTREE: I think their experience in design/build is right on. They've been involved in the project at a number of levels and the preparation of the design/build RFP is going to be a critical piece for us. And they have that specific experience. The key project personnel that they're proposing obviously have the experience, but I guess the concern or question is, are those people going to be available for this project. If they're on the Alameda project, are they going to be able to just drop that and come up here and jump in the middle of this one. And so that's an issue, I think, to be addressed.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I certainly have to agree with Dave. The key issues I had in mind were the design -- or actually having a firm that had experience in the design/build arena, the trenching that's going to be taking place in this in an urban environment, a sensitive urban environment. And I, too, had a questions about availability. So I think they have a lot of experience in this specific site type project, specifically.

In terms of the partnering, I thought they had shown that -- they actually didn't show. I felt they had had a strong team, but really wasn't conveyed clearly enough in the proposal. I felt they had good experience in terms of cost estimating based on their experience as well. And then in terms of the political conditions or the public relations I thought may have been a little bit weak in that area, if any area.

MR. RIGDON: Yeah, like that last one we just reviewed, I mean, the skills here were highly impressive. I was especially impressed with the fact that they've done the design/<sup>21</sup>billed ^ build and those types of things. But also we had the thing about working below the waterline, and they haven't just worked below the waterline, they've actually worked under water on a lot of these projects, so that was kind of -- it's good to know that they've got that experience of dealing with water situations like that.

The cost estimating, it's obvious that they can do a great job with the cost estimating. I was going to bring up the same thing about Jerry. I think from that standpoint, some of the partnering stuff that Steve brought up and some of the PR stuff that was brought up, I had concerns about that myself. I think Jerry, the thing that brought them back up in that area for me, though, was Jerry's proven ability to work the local utilities and the local government entities and that type of thing.

However, I still think they're going to need to add in that area. Maybe we can talk about that when we go through the interviews. That was the only place that I thought was not 100 percent fleshed out in here. But, you know, it also stood out to me the quality control aspect, the little thing they put in about the quality control aspect on the pylons in Alameda, the concrete, whatever you call it, where they ran into the problem and were able to get it fixed early on so it didn't become a huge problem later on. So, yeah, gave them great scores in most of the categories here.

MS. DOYLE: I actually gave them very good scores in most of the categories. One of the things that I found interesting, and Councilman Aiazzi touched on it briefly was the fact that this is the only proposal out the four that mentioned our historical buildings and the possibility of having to relocate them.

And they also are the only one out of the four that mention tourism and working with the RSCVA. I read through this and they have a game plan for the RSCVA. And they actually emphasized how important it would be to be working with our tourist industry because of our special events and what could possibly be affecting our time line and the fact it's a major industry to the city.

I agree with Councilman Rigdon, where he said not only did they dig below the waterline, but they went under water. But what's impressive is they do definitely know the urban environment. If you ever get a chance to go back to Baltimore, the little metro does it go right smack under the eye clinic of John Hopkins and that's got to be some really sensitive work to be able to pull that one off.

The only place I agree they were weak, other than the mentioning of RSCVA, tourism and stuff is a little bit to the private companies, but we will -- the PR element, but they also have a very good PR team at Alameda currently, so I think they could bring that same level back. But they didn't emphasize it in the lists.

MR. RIGDON: Just a quick add on, because Dave and I both mentioned it with Sverdrup that we went to Boston, I also went to the Alameda project, too, so -- .

MR. AIAZZI: I haven't gone there.

MS. DOYLE: I'm sorry. I've been to the Alameda corridor project.

MR. VARELA: I've been all over the place, including Alameda. Just one brief thing I want to say is that I also noticed that this team, the major players on the team have been together before and worked together as a team, and you don't see that in all the cases here that some of them seem like there bringing together just for this project. These folks have done a similar project with the same team. So that's another --.

MS. DOYLE: We'll start out with you, Mr. Edgington, approach to work task, 15 through 24.

MR. EDGINGTON: I think they're very innovative and they talk of experience and work performance. The things that stand out to me is that they're talking about participating with the stockholders and the community and I think that the City of Reno needs that to get this off to a positive start.

They talk about traffic flows downtown and making sure that that's done and I think that's great. They talk about participating with the stakeholders in the phasing of utilities. I think this is the kind of firm we need to make sure that we are all successful. I was very impressed with this.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: I was actually, I liked what they said. I thought Sverdrup had a little bit better presentation here. I thought it was very interesting they already had a website up and running about this that wasn't part of our website, so that helps me a lot with -- that shows they're going the extra mile. Also, they're using Cowan and Associates as the facilitator. Obviously, he's come highly recommended for a lot of these presentations.

They also spoke in here about the cost estimating and they spoke to the cash flow projections, which is also going to be important for the city, not just the overall cost, but to

work this out for our cash flow, which is going to help out. And that they started talking about the design/build stipends also. And they have some conversation about that in here.

And there's something I hadn't thought of before, I'm sure the railroad has, about the status of what the shoefly had to be as far as main line standards or could it be a little less. That's something I hadn't even thought of before and they brought that up. I think that's also shows they have knowledge of the railroad.

MS. DOYLE: John?

MR. HOVANICK: I would agree with pretty much all the comments. You had there. I thought their discussion on the wall was pretty good. I think the wall is very critical to the project and how to get through this, you know, the sands and gravels and boulders and I think that's going to be a real key issue in putting the proposals together for the design/build and addressing those issues.

MR. VARELA: Again, they were very well organized and specifically addressed each point that we were looking for in here and did a good job. But one particular item I thought was unique and needs to be brought up was they understood the fact, especially when you look at the utilities and the issue of utilities, it's a major issue with us, especially with regards to getting them cleared, working with utilities to make sure it doesn't delay our contractor because everyday is going to be a similar amount of dollars.

They understand that not only the typical approach to, you know, doing proper coordination with them, doing the design properly and all that and locating the utility and then cooperate during construction. They understand the aspect of there's agreements out there and that it's very important to get a utility agreement up front as to what roles the utility's going to play and everything. And I bring that up, because that wasn't necessarily brought up with some of the others and that shows a very good understanding of that relationship for this kind of construction project. So I thought that was something that I wanted to bring out as overall they did a good job. Also Sverdrup had brought up that same issue.

MR. RIGDON: I'm going to ditto all the comments that have been said so far and just add that there was -- one of the things that really stood out to me in their approach was they have a whole section here just on business impact mitigation, which nobody else had.

And I really like the idea that they're going to sit down and develop an individual strategy for each, single business that's going to be affected along the corridor, which is something that has been a goal of the City's to do. So I found that to be really helpful.

I also like found it fascinating, not being an engineer, all the detail on how to build the wall. That was very interesting reading. And I, as I mentioned before, I think on some of the PR stuff, similar to the comments I made about the Sverdrup, they seem to already know what message they want to communicate and who they want to communicate it to.

I would have like to have seen more of let's go out and find out what people are thinking first and then tailor a message or tailor responses to that, type of an approach.

The groups, they mentioned that they wanted to go speak to, I'm not sure, groups that need convincing on the project. I think there's probably going to be need to identify some better work in that area. But that's -- that's very similar to my reaction to the Sverdrup proposal, too and I think it's just that they are engineering companies and not public relations companies, necessarily so. But overall, I gave them, again really high scores in this area, too. And like Dave said on Sverdrup, I think the same thing here, we've got such detail that we're going to be able to, whoever we choose, pull things out of here and use them and that's very helpful.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I certainly have to agree with ^24allot ^ a lot of the comments that have already been made. I give him extremely high marks. In terms of -- one of the things I'd like to point out that I valued was their approach to the risk allocation. I felt they made a strong statement in terms of no stipends. I thought that they obviously had some experience to step forward and speak strongly about that.

Also, the information transfer in terms of dealing with the public safety. I think the transfer of information, essentially that was their philosophy, was to transfer that information out to the public, to the users in the city in terms of travelers, any users in the downtown vicinity. I thought that was a good approach.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Well, I guess I'll just echo some of things that have already been mentioned. I was impressed with the business impact mitigation plan that they put together and the specifics that they provided. I liked the fact that they've created those websites and I think that would be a good tool for the community to use.

With regard to dissemination of information, community relations. The fact that they went so far as they'd develop a children's video to help get the information out.

One of the things they said in here is that the highest priority I will be to first identify project issues and participate in resolving. I was a little disappointed that they didn't point to the partnering as the means or the mechanism to do that. Notwithstanding the fact they got Cowan as their partnering subconsultant, and I suspect that Mr. Cowan will do a good job for whoever he's going to be working for, but I think they could have stressed the fact that the partner will be that kind of basis by which those issues will be resolved.

MS. DOYLE: One of the things that I liked about this is that they did the -- not only on the affected businesses, but they also addressed safety, because that's has been probably one of the biggest questions we had been approached by.

And also they actually have quite a bit in here about traffic impacts, and the fact that they're using Fers Pers. Because the other concern we have, not only from businesses, but residents is what are you guys going to be doing about closing the streets and what about Virginia. And they actually address it in here and I find that to be helpful and beneficial that they thought to put it in. That is my two cents, because by the time it gets to me, you guys have said it all, so this is good.

We will now go to page five. Mr. Rigdon, we'll start with you this time.

MR. RIGDON: Again, this is a summary of it and I think they did an excellent job of summarizing their proposal. The organization of this proposal was excellent. Didn't find any quality of the assurance mistakes in the proposal, like I mentioned earlier, with the Sverdrup proposal, and just overall was a very highly impressed, very detailed and really spoke to the evaluation criteria that we were looking at. I really like that organization that they had in the way they put together. So I gave them a really high score.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Again, high marks as well. I felt they had a real good understanding in terms of controlling the project. And most of them, I wanted to point out that I felt they had a good understanding of a fixed budget and how they were able to control that and I think that may be a key factor on this project.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Again, as a summary of the basic document, I think they did a really good job of organizing their responses to the various issues. It was easy to follow. And they obviously have good experience and great personnel that they've assigned to the project.

MR. EDGINGTON: I also agree with what's been said. I would like to point out that I like the design/build steering committee that was brought out in this, engineering the record for quality assurance and how that's going to happen. And they touched a little bit on everything from underpinning the structures to wall finishes, and I think that was great.

MR. AIAZZI: The negative I'll say about this one is probably my lack of understanding about when they talked about this design/build steering committee and they were talking about having the communications being strictly controlled and maybe that is a legal issue there. But for the sensitivity and the political realm here, I'm not sure if I -- maybe I didn't understand that correctly. So I'll just mark them down, not because that's a negative, but they didn't explain it well enough to assist me in looking at this.

But overall, I thought it was like the other ones we dealt with so far, they have a very good organizational plan in here that they're going to work with. This section, for me, though, on them, the three pages on this was a little lacking. It really didn't really flush out a lot of the issues they talked about like program insurance was only one paragraph long.

MR. HOVANICK: I think overall they showed a pretty good understanding of all the requirements of the project and they did bring a lot of experience on the Alameda project to bear in putting this proposal together and I think that's a strength of it.

MR. VARELA: Just real briefly. Mostly the same things. They did, like the others, stressed the technical aspects a lot and there's so many of this, although they didn't do as well as someone there was focused on the technical rather than the other aspects of it. But like Dave Aiazzi, I think they could have done a better job on that particular part.

MS. DOYLE: Cool. We are done with --.

The last one, page six, knowledge of project's specific conditions. Mr. Varela.

MR. VARELA: In this case, they did a darn good job in summarizing the project issues, the geotech, stakeholders, utilities, operational issues, even mentions Fitzgerald's in particular. And good on project issues. Overall, they have a good understanding of the conditions of the particular projects and especially with the knowledge of the geotech, Kleinfeld, of course, have the extensive background.

MR. HOVANICK: I would agree with Steve's assessment. I thought they showed a very good understanding of the project.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: I thought they showed they could identified what they were. I thought, again, they were a little bit lacking in the explanation in how they were going to deal with them. And I was really looking forward to today to hear what Fitzgerald's thought about their paragraph dealing with you, were they right?

MS. DOYLE: For the record, Mr. Edgington, would you like to tell people where you work?

MR. EDGINGTON: Yes. I'm the senior director of Fitzgerald's, partially. How's that?

Hotel is one of my areas and we are working through all that on our partnering committees.

I, too, would like what they have to say here. They talk about interrupt of power service or utility services for the downtown corridor is great. They talk about operational issues and pedestrian access. They seem to be keeping the businesses in mind down there. I think that's great. I give them a high score on this.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Again, the personnel that they have assigned here have good knowledge and experience and that bodes well, I think, for a group like this taking on the

project. Again, pointing to their specific reference to Fitzgerald's, I think that just points out they've got a real sensitivity to the business community down there and a good understanding that it's going to take some additional effort to support the businesses during the project.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I'd have to say certainly high marks again, based on the experience they'll be carrying on to this, sort of a lessons learned or the knowledge they had learned from the Alameda corridor project, I'm they could apply those to the specific site conditions here.

MR. RIGDON: Yeah, I'm going to ditto everything. I gave them really high marks on this. I think they've obviously been watching the process pretty attentively as well, just like Sverdrup had. That's obvious from their proposal. And the thing I really, again, they've got -- they already have a member of their team who demonstrated experience working with FHWA, NDOT and the city and the other relationships, governmental relationships that are going to be required with this. So I gave them real high marks on that, too.

MS. DOYLE: I will ditto everything. I did learn a lesson from doing this is I started out with them first and so I saw that some things, and I finally put it away, and decided to go through the other four and then went back to them. It's kind of an interesting, because they have all the experience with Alameda. I think that was one of the things I did gave them the high scores on is because they know exactly all the conditions that we're going to have to go through if this project goes forward.

We're halfway done.

Proposer number three.

Excuse me, Mr. Novak. We're going to take a kidney break.

MR. NOVAK: Okay, I can, too.

(A short break was taken at this time.)

MS. DOYLE: We will reconvene. And we'll go to proposal number three, which is Carter-Burgess, that doesn't have a name like the Truckee Meadows ReTRAC Team.

MR. BOOCK: That's the only one with -- .

MS. DOYLE: The only cutesy name. Mr. Varela, we'll start with you.

MR. VARELA: This is a little bit more difficult to focus in on the specific areas here. But as an organization, the proposal was a little different, so you had to read a little bit more in depth to get it. But overall, I didn't see any, at least it wasn't brought out where I could see it that they had a lot of design/build experience, especially in preparing documents involved in construction.

Some association with different things, some of the project managers, deputy project manager had design/build experience, but mostly highway or on this regard and not very much rail as compared to some others.

I think it was a little bit hard and I want to ask some of the others if they found some of these things, maybe you found this, and I couldn't find them. In particular, experience in design and construction below the water table, I didn't find any reference or anything at all regarding those kinds of things.

And any reference related to knowledge of working in the constrained environment such as what we have downtown, just I'm asking for maybe someone could fill me in on that. And not much information about partnering at all, if any.

MS. DOYLE: So some of us shouldn't feel bad if we have zeros? John?

MR.HOVANICK: I pretty much echo Steve's comments on this. What was the last one that you asked, the constrained environment. Was this the one, I get them a little confused sometimes, but they worked on the I15. Is this the I15? So I think they had some experience in that respect, but I don't know if that was -- it's probably my lack of knowledge of the I15 project. I think they had some project experience. But otherwise I would agree. I had to do a lot of flipping around to find stuff, I thought.

MR. AIAZZI: I think there's going to be a couple of people happy with all these proposals. I noticed that I think everybody has Property Specialists, Incorporation and they all have Charles Cowan. That's probably why they're not represented here, because they're going to be one of the finalists in any event.

But this one in particular, like Mr. Varela, I didn't fill out anything on here. I just haven't found it. I was waiting to hear from you guys. There's a lot of pages here, in fact probably a third of the whole document is taken up with resumes of the various people involved. They did talk about that, and that's both good and bad.

I was able to look at the -- well, a lot of field expertise might be there, when I looked at some of the educational requirements, I didn't see ^27allot ^ a lot of the education there in something that's going to be this large. Not to say this company couldn't do something, but this is a real big project, I think, for the City of Reno. I don't think this just overall, I don't think this proposal met up to what I was expecting.

MS. DOYLE: Dan.

MR. EDGINGTON: I think they have a great team assembled here and some of the answers I did find, but you got to go to the resumes to actually get the answers out and draw them out. It made it kind of hard to follow what we have here.

I would have liked to see a little more small business approach, too, on this. But like I say, I did get a lot of answers to a lot of this is here. But I had to go to the individual resumes like safety was Davis and you had to go right to that resume of that person who was doing that particular job to get the answers. Great resumes, but I felt that it's just kind of hard to read and pull everything out that I want.

MR. ROUNDTREE: I agree that the organization of the proposal was a little more difficult to follow. As Steve noted, they do have some good people assigned to the project, but it appears as though they're not as strong in rail experience as they are in highway projects and I didn't see a strong indication of design/build experience or preparation of design/build documents. There's some, but certainly not as strong as what we've seen in the two previously proposals.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I think on this proposal, I think organization was a major barrier for me in terms of trying to decipher information. That, also, and minimal discussion of specific topics. I think bottom line, there was some experience was conveyed in terms of railroad and so forth, but specifically in design/build rail trench construction experience in an urban environment wasn't displayed and I thought it was real heavy in terms of the resumes as well and it's very difficult, again, to decipher or strain that information out.

MR. RIGDON: I just echo the comments of everybody else. I also like Dan went through and I found some of the stuff in individual resumes, but the concern I have there is they may have done that stuff with other companies, not necessarily with Carter-Burgess and it wasn't clear to me where that experience was coming from.

The organization of it, what I would have -- I mean, what we saw in the last two proposals was they talked specifically about projects. They had the resumes and stuff in

there to show that those people worked on those projects there, but they specifically talked about projects that they had worked on. And this was very, very light on any details of the projects and how those projects were done.

I gave them a zero, Steve, in the supervision of below water table, because I could not find it, even going through the individual resumes could not find it in there. It was just -- it was also very difficult and maybe this was just something I noticed, with the background in sales and marketing, it seemed to be the proposal lacks specifics and dealt with very general fluff marketing statements and those types of things about their company. And what I was looking for, like on the last two, was specific information about what they had done, so it was difficult to get through all that marketing jargon and get into what the actual specifics of the proposal and where their skill and experience was.

They do have, Charles -- I ranked them fairly high on the partnering, because they do have the Charles Cowan and his resume is obviously very good. And they do have some local participation here, people who have -- who are familiar with the local political conditions and things, CFA and Ken Crater.

And those people do have a tremendous amount of knowledge about the local area. They didn't really flush out, though, how those people would be, you know, working with the group and it didn't look like Carter-Burgess overall, while those individuals had a lot of local experience dealing in the local environment, it didn't look like Carter-Burgess as a whole had a lot of that experience and really knew what was need there. So, overall, I gave them a pretty medium, lukewarm type of ranking.

MS. DOYLE: When I look at my ranking sheets, it's not really high up. I was having problems with this one also. Maybe it is the way that the proposal is set up. But the below water table was kind of -- they got a zero. The other one that I was having difficulty with is the number 7, which is the management of the utility relocation. Couldn't find anything really strong in here about that. And that's like a major component.

And the other one to me was number 12, demonstrated skill and experience working with a wide variety of government officials. The other one, that I know Councilman Rigdon was discussing, you know, some of the people that are involved. I'm also talking once again about our community relations, PR. There was no mention about business relocation, nothing about the historical aspects of some of the buildings that they're going to be working with, and just like the political climate. And so I ranked them relatively low for the first phase of it.

I was trying to find some really heavy-duty rail experience and could not find it. And I think if you're building two and a half miles of rail lines and then some, they should have -- that should be like up front and I can't find it, unless it's in tiny writing somewhere.

Okay. Approach to work task. John, we'll start with you.

MR. HOVANICK: Well, overall I think they put together, you know, a pretty good proposal, as far as how they're going to approach the task. But at times I would have liked maybe a little more detail. But, again, I think they have a good team here. They've got the right people. It was just trying to bring it out, maybe a little more in the proposal to the -- to put it in front of me just blatantly, just put it right in front of me a little more would have been a little better for me. But, overall, I think they did approach the work in an organized manner and tried to cover everything that needs to be covered.

MR. AIAZZI: I think, at least in this section, they put in all the steps that they felt need to happen. I didn't see anything that, obviously, that they missed. And it might actually spill

into another part of the criteria, but it was in this section, some things stood out for me. Like they said, they understood the phase one of the work project is focused on verification of project and may also include final design.

I mean, they weren't really telling us what they think it should be, you know, what do you believe it should be. And also when they said if our review of the costs indicates they're greater than currently budgeted and their number three option is to undertake an effort to support the pursuit of additional funding. I think we made that fairly clear here, there is no additional funding. That's what I mean about this might be spilling out on to the local conditions and the politics of what may be going on that maybe they don't understand the local conditions here.

MR. EDGINGTON: I agree with what's been said so far. I think they did a better job on this section and you can pull it out a lot easier. I think the thing I liked the best was the project management plans, environmental mitigation and dispute resolutions. I think that these are important. This is better than the first portion of it. I think their approach is fine.

MR. ROUNDTREE: A couple of things that I thought were noteworthy in this area. Their master schedule and schedule reporting, I think, is a key part. It's obviously important for the schedule to be prepared well and to be followed and the way you're going to do that is to keep track of it on a regular basis.

Their cost control and reporting, again, is a significant part. I was disappointed in their public affairs and construction relations section. It's -- it was kind of like they were -- they said, well, this is what we're going to tell you or this is how we're going to tell it to you. It wasn't inclusive. It was like, we're going to be telling you instead of you being part of this process and including the businesses and the community as part of that whole community relations, community information effort. So I was a little disappointed. Maybe it's just my reading of that, but that's kind of the feeling I got out of what they had in there.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Could have been me, I really had a hard time, and help me out here if anybody else can find information on -- in terms of the approach, the problem solving approach or the utilities that you mentioned earlier or the public relations. I felt that there was a lot of that lacking in some of those areas. And essentially came to the conclusion that little experience with other similar projects, probably made it difficult for them to provide a quality approach.

MR. RIGDON: Yeah, a lot of what everybody else said is echoed by me. I gave them, you know, a fairly good scores in the management methods for reporting on progress, controlling schedule. I thought that section was pretty good. The partnering, I gave them a pretty good score on.

But what was really, again, I get back to the issue of the fluff. Like Dave was saying about the public affairs, they've got this affected businesses in the downtown community will be fully informed in a timely fashion of construction impacts and mitigations. Well, who wouldn't say that. I mean, every proposer has said that. They didn't put in here how they're going to do it. Like all the little ideas we were looking at from the other ones, all the little -- the details, I guess, that we could pull out and say, yeah, that's a good idea or that's not a good idea. And that type of a thing and I think that gets back to a lack of knowledge at the upper level here of exactly what we're dealing with in the environment here and those types of things.

And like the thing that Dave pointed out was the very first thing that caught my eye. I mean, the very first statement they come in with is we'll review the cost estimates, and if it's

more, we'll go find some more money, which is not exactly the approach that we were looking for.

MS. DOYLE: And just my two cents in on this is , once again, is I got -- I thought I was the only one, David -- Roundtree, since there's three of you sitting here.

MR. ROUNDTREE: We'll take over soon.

MS. DOYLE: I know. All Dave all the time. Was that they were going to tell us how they were going to run the public relations. And to me that does not make me feel real good, because I think some of the biggest discussions we've had the council table has been about the affected businesses and the affected community. And let them be actively involved and be masters of their own ship and have some input, and that's not here.

The other one that I gave them a zero on was number 24, which is the overall approach to maintaining the integrity, security and safety of the UP. I looked through here, nothing. There's absolutely nothing. And that right there, I think, would be like the first two pages and not even in their cover letter is it mentioned that this is going to be a key project. And so I think this is -- you know, they do have some good people signed up, but I just gave them relatively low scores.

Knowledge and understanding of the ReTRAC project, page five. Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. VARELA: You skipped me this time, but that's okay .

MS. DOYLE: I'm sorry, Steve.

MR. VARELA: I just want to make comment. You could see their overall knowledge of large construction design projects is there and their overall approach at the beginning showed all the typical textbook steps. But there was lack of specifics regarding how they might approach this particular project. And I found the same thing, I didn't find anything related to how they were going to deal with UP and UP issues. There was nothing that I could read that I could find. That's the one thing I wanted to see if anyone else found that.

And the overall problem solving approach. They didn't really address how they were going to solve problems as they came up, what would be their approach and steps and the whole thing, so that was another area.

But I'm sure that maybe in the future they would address that. But I didn't see it in this.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I wanted to ask a question. What's the criteria that we have in front of us supplied in the RFP? I feel pretty strongly if we provided that specifically and it wasn't even addressed. There was no cue taken to address those specifically and that's also telling something as well.

MR. RIGDON: You know, Steve, I think you just hit the nail on the head what I was feeling through the whole -- reading this whole proposal is they do obviously have construction management experience and have that and they put all those textbook things in here. But it's almost like they never even came here. I mean, they never even dealt with any of the specific things dealing with this project, specific things. So I gave them good points in areas where overall -- and even on the one where Sherrie said she gave them zero on the safety for UP, I was charitable and gave them five, because I had a feeling they would just do that because they know they -- they've done those types of projects before and they know they need to do those things, but they didn't specifically mention it at all in here. And, so, that's probably the best way to sum it up.

MR. AIAZZI: I think to follow up on that, one of the things I noticed very first page three of section one, says 85 percent of their work is repeat business. Part of this might be

that you have to go out and learn how to get new business and this is not the right way, I don't think.

MR. RIGDON: Although that's a positive, too.

MR. AIAZZI: Oh, absolutely. It's a very good, positive thing, but to entice new business in, you at least have respond to what the RFP asks for.

MS. DOYLE: I'm glad you mentioned that, because we have a copy of the RFP, and the first two proposals that we looked at actually pretty much go by the RFP, the way they do their headers on their pages. This one doesn't do that. So you're wondering if they even read the RFP. So interesting comments, gentlemen. Ready for page five? Mr. Aiazzi.

MR. AIAZZI: This is page five, make sure I'm on the right one. This was only two pages long and the response to this and this is the part where I actually thought they read the RFP, because it pretty much reads like the RFP.

I saw where they took what we asked for and put that in, this is what we're going to do, but not how we're going to do it. We understand that you need this and we understand that you need that. They defined quality as meeting or exceeding the city's expectations. I didn't see a lot of filling out about how they're going to meet these things, how am I going to get cost confidence in this company or how are they going to get into public involvement and the schedule control. They reiterated what the RFP asked us -- asked them to respond to here.

MR. EDGINGTON: I have to agree with Mr. Aiazzi on this. The public involvement to me is really crucial in this job. And they talk about it, but they don't describe how they're going to complete it. I feel this is almost like a generic. You could almost put this against any job, if you take out the ReTRAC portion.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Part of this criteria is that the proposer demonstrate that his team can effectively deal with the many diverse items. And you get the sense that they can, because they had a lot of good construction, big construction project experience, but I don't think they demonstrated it very well. They just didn't lay it out in front of us to the point where we can see, yeah, boy, they really did that.

And, again, I think the design/build, specific design/build experience is not nearly as strong as the other proposals.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I agree with Dave, this Dave over here, that I think demonstration was the key. I think that they most likely they had demonstrated they had a strong team, but they didn't demonstrate how they were going to implement that team on the project.

I'm not sure that they demonstrated to me what their understanding may be of specific barriers that may be encountered on this project or how they would evaluate it and deal with those type barriers.

In summary, I guess my score would be similar to the last one in terms of just probably being fair.

MR. RIGDON: Well, I, when I first looked at this, I was getting, like Dave said, the sense that they can do a project like this. And but they -- and so I gave them a score of 120 out of 200, but I'm probably going to be revising this downward after the discussions that we've had here over this, because I really don't think that they demonstrated it. And so while I got that sense out of it, there is that feeling that something's lacking when you get done reading this, so --.

MS. DOYLE: Steve.

MR. VARELA: Overall, I pretty much echo that. I think they identified the major issues in the end, but they didn't progress forward to again summarize and they didn't even put it in the previous sections of how they'd approach the major issues. So they did -- you get the sense they know what they're doing.

And one thing they didn't do, which is really important part of this ReTRAC project is they did not stress the importance of business impacts. I mean, that is just essential and that was totally void in that particular section.

MR. HOVANICK: I would pretty much echo Mr. Roundtree's comments as well. I think they have a team with the experience to do the work here and I would've liked to have seen a little more specifics. It would have helped me understand it better. Possibly, if they make it to the interview stage, this can come out at that point, but that would be my comment.

MS. DOYLE: I have none. Everything's been said. I like this job.

Page six, develop the project specific conditions. Todd, you've been relatively quiet, we'll start with you and go to David Roundtree after you.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I guess in the interest of time, I probably just state that I thought very little foot work was done in terms of their discovery of the project site conditions. And in following, I gave them a fair score.

MR. ROUNDTREE: I'd agree. I think they have a general understanding, but they haven't shown to me that they have a specific understanding or real, I guess, a firsthand or a keen involvement in this thing at this point. I suspect they can probably get up to speed, but I don't think they've done the background, the foot work up to this point.

MR. EDGINGTON: I agree with both of them. One thing I'd like to point out on the responsibilities, the way they've got that written where they're taking the owner out of responsibility and putting a contractor is going to settle disputes, I think this is bigger than that and I think the downtown core is going to have to work together and every property is going to have its own similar issues and will be times that properties will have to work with the city and make sure that their issues are handled.

But the identified mitigation process in this, I really don't think they understand all the issues downtown and the problems associated with keeping the downtown core operating and functioning while all of this is going on.

MR. AIAZZI: I'm not sure if this is the first time that a project like this has been undertaken with a board like this in public and with elected officials. And I'm sorry if it sounds so brutal, but some of us who haven't worked with these and done this kind of stuff before, I don't read the nuances in there, I just look at this presentation and to me this is very lacking, particularly this section.

Again, it's two pages long, and actually there's a big chart on one page, and then they talk about their work with other companies. It's actually less than a page long about how they're going to deal with the knowledge of the specific conditions here. That to me tells me they don't have the knowledge of the specific conditions, and I don't know the parties involved and if it sounds tough, I'm sorry, but all I have to go on is this book. I gave them a 20.

MS. DOYLE: So did I.

MR. HOVANICK: I think they covered, you know, some of the stakeholder experience here by reference to other projects, but specific to this project, I thought it was somewhat lacking there. But that's the problem I have.

MR. VARELA: One other thing, just to add is they do have experience working with the various entities, NDOT and federal highways and UP, so they did mention that part of it, but like everyone else I think the specifics weren't there.

MR. RIGDON: One of the things that I found interesting about one of the other proposals was they -- we been still having meetings with stakeholders and stuff after we sent out the request for proposal and that type of thing. And one of the other proposers specifically mentioned, and it was obvious in their proposal that they were already attending those meetings and trying to figure out what those nuances were and what the concerns of the stakeholders and that type of thing were. It was very obvious reading this that these folks hadn't done that. And the lack of mentioning it, and it's almost like they haven't even followed the process up to this point. They're just blindly coming in and putting this together at the last minute. It's kind of the sense I got.

I actually gave them a 60, but, again, I'm probably going to be revising that downward.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. We'll say good-bye to the Carter-Burgess.

Mr. Novak, are you still there?

MR. NOVAK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. DOYLE: How are we doing so far?

MR. PRICE: Right on track, following the rules very well.

MS. DOYLE: Thank you. Number four is Atser-Ledcor. Proposer and key personnel skill and experience. Mr. Rigdon, we will start with you.

MR. RIGDON: Let me get my thoughts organized here.

MS. DOYLE: I'm sorry.

MR. RIGDON: That's all right. I thought one of things that I mentioned on the last proposal was they didn't talk about their projects. I thought this one talked about their projects really well in here and laid them out so we knew exactly what they were working on and exactly what their participation was.

The thing that concerned me was there wasn't really anything in here about rail projects specifically and the scale of the projects was much different than some of the other proposers. There was a \$367 million project in here, there was a project that was 30 to \$35 million a year for the street and bridge program. There was a little bit of work on the I15 corridor, but that was really just -- that wasn't program management, that was inspection and verification and the electronic reporting system.

Whereas some of the other proposers they were dealing with the big dig, the big billion dollar type of projects. So that was something that stood out to me from the -- I think they put together a pretty good team on this, but, again, I'm not sure that the experience matches the specific experience or the specific project, necessarily, that we have here. And I may be way off base with that, but that's what I came up with.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I, too, feel they didn't have a lot of railroad experience. There was very little discussion in the request for preliminary proposals for the design builder. I felt there was lacking experience in the key personnel positions.

I got a sense that there was -- they were really strong in terms of construction management. And although this project is going to require a lot of construction management, mostly on the ^tail ^ tale end, I still felt that there's other strong components of the projects as well, in terms of dealing with the utilities, the public involvement and so forth that weren't adequately addressed, but I do feel they could -- I sensed a strong presence in the CM portion.

Overall, I felt that it was a somewhat general proposal, may be more time could have been spent to address these other issues beyond the CM or the construction management phase.

MR. ROUNDTREE: I'd agree that they've shown pretty good construction management experience. I agree with Mr. Rigdon as well that the scale of the projects that they've pointed out is not as significant as the other proposals we've seen as well as not showing any specific rail experience. I think that lacks -- I mean, it's pretty outstanding in its shortcoming.

Aside from that, I think they've assigned personnel with reasonable experience to the various elements that need to be covered. And they've got a decent team that haven't shown in the proposal, at least, the experience, I think, that we'd be looking for.

MR. EDGINGTON: This is another one I had trouble finding all the answers I wanted. I had to actually go to the separate teams to get the things answered. But I did find where they had some good background. They've had some railroad relocations and the built a four thousand foot wall three foot deep and the other one was, I think, 7,000 by 50 foot betonite wall. I think they have a good team here. I think I would have liked to have seen them follow the format better on their presentation here.

MR. AIAZZI: I'm not going to make a lot of statements. I think they have a good team. I don't think they're large enough to take us right now. I don't know whether I should be concerned, the company was formed in 1993, which only gives seven or eight years of experience at Atser.

And they talk about they do \$12 million of work per year, that represents the value of \$300 million per year, and that struck me, because I looked at their project management stuff and they saw -- they told us how big the projects were, I mean, obviously, it didn't add up. They obviously had a very small portion of all of these other projects that they had talked about.

So while they have done some excellent work from what I can see it in here, I just don't, for me, know that it comes up to the level we're talking about a \$250 million project.

MR. HOVANICK: Well, I have -- I would agree with Todd. I thought they were strong on the construction management side. Also, with Dave here on the age of the company. I was looking through the resumes and the top four people on their organizational chart have been with Atser for one to two years. It's fairly new in that respect. Now, they have a lot of experience in the industry, experience at other firms is very high, but with Atser, it's one to two years on the top four people.

MR. VARELA: Briefly, again, the organization of the proposal was difficult to discern things. But going back on the resumes, you found some folks, the project manager, Mr. Dye, worked on I15. He was involved in the design/build, but I didn't find the deputy project manager have any design/build experience. There's a lot of key personnel I don't feel have the background and I couldn't find the project development manager's resume. I don't know if the rest of you did. Maybe I just missed it.

But there was a few other key things that I couldn't find. Again, like the other firm, I didn't find any below the ground water table concrete invert type stuff being installed. I didn't find a lot of experience in the utility, project management utility relocation, knowledge of working in constrained environment similar to this. I didn't find that.

And I didn't see much on public affairs experience and partnering agreement, working on actually preparing a partnering agreements for projects like this. I mean, there's people

who have public affairs background, but never worked with another big firm doing this particular type of project, big highway or rail type construction.

So I don't know if the rest of you found any of that that would give me some more insight.

MS. DOYLE: Steve, no, actually, I was looking -- one of the coolest things about their proposal is that they are involved with the new NFL stadium. So if we ever need a stadium.

I did find some rail experience with Perry King, who is going to be the principal in charge. And I'm just wondering what year they did the 19 mile railway spur in Cameron Bay Vietnam and also in Pikou and Panmathuet. But I think jungle environment -- what got me is jungle environment is a little bit different than our glacial outwash. And that's what I was having difficulty with is that does not -- I did not find anything that in the first set that specifically identified just the geology of our area. And they have had some, by looking at this, they have massive experience in runways, airports, air. Mr. King is a graduate from somewhere from the Air Force school of something.

But also, you know, I was uncomfortable with the fact that they didn't put a lot of emphasis in here on the political environment. And, once again, is the partnering agreements was not real strong. And this was also another tough proposal to read.

MR. RIGDON: One of the things about the resumes that kind of stood out to me, too, similar to the, you know, just the couple of years with Atser and that type of thing, but was also looking at the experience on the resumes and where they're placing them on the organization chart. We all mentioned that public affairs and construction relations with regards to the other applications were really important, and they've got that in here, but the person that they have assigned to it doesn't have specific public relations and construction relations experience, as far as dealing with the public and that type of thing. I don't know if they -- there's a third party here that they're going to contract out with or something like that, but -- and I know the person who does this, he's a great guy, but I'm not sure the specific experience that that person has has ever been setting up a public affairs type of program. But I guess we could find out that in the interview process. But at least for that, that came out as a very low score for me.

MS. DOYLE: I was wondering about that, because usually the other three are bringing in companies. And this one has got listed the individual. So in my -- and they're also, just to backtrack a little, there was -- I don't know if anyone else found it, but there was very little or almost no mention of our historical components of what they're going to have to work with with several of our buildings.

And not much about traffic mitigation, especially for special events and our tourism industry, I didn't find that in here. I don't know if the rest of you found it or we're looking for ghosts.

MR. VARELA: I think when we talk about the other aspects of this, like their approach or their specific experience, we can talk about that, but as far as the background of the employees.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. Page three, approach to work tasks.

MR. HOVANICK: One other comment. One of the things I did find, there was a good discussion of some of the below water table on appendix B. Back in appendix B they did have some discussion of the below water table construction. Not real specific. They did address the local conditions at Reno and acknowledged the geology somewhat. So just for the team, that might be a section to rereview or look at again.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. That also goes back to knowing the political conditions, because what has been some of our biggest controversy has just been the water stuff, hitting a rock the size of a house, that kind of stuff. So instead of hiding it in appendix B, because by the time we get through all this, it should have been up front. But thank you for pointing that out.

Approach to work tasks. Mr. Varela, since you mentioned it.

MR. VARELA: Let me get back to that. Again, it was kind of hard to read, but they did talk about some specific elements that were important, like the cost review. Partnering focused on internal teams; however, one of the parts that they discussed in partnering was it was focused on internal teams partnering and not all the outside stakeholders involved in the partnering. So that's an important piece of partnering that I think was lost in their approach to the project.

Public relations talked about meetings, those kinds of things that we'd have. I think they did okay in that regard, discussion of public relations.

It was hard for me to find lines of authority or who the task leaders, necessarily, in this project. I had a tough difficult time with that a little bit, but let's see. And I had a problem, they didn't mention at all anything about safety, integrity of UP and that kind of thing. It was not part of this.

MR. HOVANICK: I really don't have anything more to add to what Steve said. I think that's pretty thorough.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Aiazzi?

MR. AIAZZI: Agree.

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Edgington?

MR. EDGINGTON: I agree with Steve on what his comments were. You know, their executive leadership team does not include any business people at all. I think that's a negative.

MR. ROUNDTREE: That's one of the things I noted as we is they didn't seem to have a good focus on a need for close communications or support for the downtown businesses. I mean, obviously, it's an element, but it's not a highlighted part of what they've pointed out here.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Again, I gave them a very low score as well. I think there was very little discussion on some of the key elements of the approach, specifically the schedule and the coordination. There was often a lot of discussions without -- a lot of talking about the things that we were going to do, but no mention of how. I scored them pretty high on number 22 based on their CM or QA/QC experience, however, the remainder were pretty low scores.

MR. RIGDON: From my standpoint, in reading this proposal, and I'm going to contrast it with the Carter-Burgess proposal a little bit. The first section, I gave them a really low score, but on this section, I actually gave them a higher score. Whereas, I was kind of opposite on the Carter-Burgess proposal. I think they had some innovative approaches here. One of the things I thought was pretty innovative was that the computerized reporting system that they had mentioned in here and put the appendix in on it. I thought that was kind of a neat use of technology.

MR. AIAZZI: A Palm Pilot.

MR. RIGDON: Well, yeah, the Palm Pilot, and the fact that it's a real time reporting. It's not a monthly reporting basis or that type of thing. I thought that was kind of an innovative thing in here.

With safety, I gave them fairly high marks. They didn't specifically address railroad safety, but they had -- it's obvious that they have the construction management experience, because they've got some pretty good safety programs listed in here from what I could see.

Was a little weak, again, on the public affairs, the communications with the downtown businesses and some of those things. And I think that's just that they haven't -- that goes back to my earlier comment, that I don't think they had the people on their team, necessarily, at least so far from what I've seen to really put together a good specific program like some of the other proposers did on how they're going to do it. I actually thought that was kind of weak in here, as far as this one goes. So for most of the approach, I gave them a pretty high score, but with some of those weak things on the public relations.

MR. AIAZZI: I have just a technology thing. I also thought that that was very interesting what they did, but what I was concerned about is it also seemed like it was proprietary.

MR. RIGDON: It is proprietary.

MR. AIAZZI: Which means it would be very difficult for someone else to come in later. I think when you have a project of this scope, other people have to be able to have access to it. What happens if, you know, although they're bonded and everything, if they go away, what happens to that kind of software. On these kinds of projects, I prefer things that are standard in the industry rather than proprietary. You want to take some standard use and make something that makes the reporting better, that's the concern I have, is it might be really good, but I want other people to be able to use it and understand it other than their team.

MR. RIGDON: That would be an interesting thing to bring out in the interview process, because you're right, we wouldn't want any kind of data formatting to be proprietary. Any kind of proprietary format of the data. But I did like the real time aspect of it and the other people did, they had standard Windows NT and certain things that were there that could cross over. I think we'd have to get a better understanding of that system.

MS. DOYLE: Okay. Next page. Mr. Roundtree?

MR. ROUNDTREE: In the proposal, they put together a table showing stakeholders and issues, concerns and who on that part of the team that would address it. I thought it was interesting and fairly comprehensive, although I think it could have gone into more detail. Some of the issues and concerns are those, I think, that are definitely out there. But they haven't indicated -- how they intend to address those issues. They've identified what the issues are and who is going to do it, but there's no indication as of what it is they're going to do to address them. So I thought that was kind of a shortcoming.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I felt very similar to what Dave said. I think didn't think they addressed the project needs. I think they talked ^37allot ^ a lot around them, spoke briefly about them, but really didn't truly address them. I gave them a pretty low score.

MR. RIGDON: See, I gave them a little higher score here as well, because I think they do -- I mean, to me they showed that they understand the local issues of ReTRAC, more so than the last one we talked about, where it looked like they had a really strong construction experience and everything but hadn't never set foot here and looked at some of the local stuff.

I graded them a little higher, because it was obvious that they, too, had come here and been here and could address some of the local things. I didn't give them as high of a rating as I did the first two, because, again, they didn't have some of that specific stuff in there. But

at least they showed they understood what the issues were, at least to me, and so I gave them a little bit higher score.

MR. VARELA: I think I echo most of the first speakers here. I just -- the table was quite interesting and it was nice to know, you know, who was going to address certain issues. But there was no specifics on it. The summary wasn't really there, so -- .

MR. HOVANICK: I would echo both Daves' comments, also. I thought they had the -- I liked the table part and I also liked their local input. You know, they seem to have some more local knowledge. That's about it.

MR. AIAZZI: This might be one where I did interpret a lot more than just what's in here, because I do know that some of the principals involved are involved in the local area and they do know this stuff. And while this section is lacking, I think in some explanation, I know that they're aware of them. So that's where I can bring in my experience.

Also, this is the only one, and I might be wrong, but I actually saw where they started talking about local hiring preference program, which scored them higher in my mind on this particular section.

MR. BOOCK: Councilman Aiazzi, I want to point out being a federally funded contract that local hiring preference actually is something you cannot take into account in conjunction with your analysis. And that will be the same with design/<sup>38</sup>billed ^ build contractor as well.

MR. AIAZZI: Should I mark them down now because they put that in here?

MR. BOOCK: No. You don't have to mark them down, but it's not something that can be considered.

MR. AIAZZI: Thank you.

MR. EDGINGTON: Well, I looked at this chart, and it's kind of scary when you really look at it and see all the things that can or cannot happen. The ones that are negative here. I think this is an area they did do a little bit better job. I know they understand a lot of the problems that they've put down here. I would like to see maybe a little more summary to this section and that's all.

MS. DOYLE: One thing, I gave them a relatively okay score on this one. When I went through the chart that Mr. Roundtree pointed out, I had a chance to giggle, because it has the state coders agency owners issues and concerns. And for police, they have their issues and concerns for slips, falls, traffic, theft and overtime, fire, workplace fire, traffic congestion, interference. It would be nice if they had gone into a little more detail and maybe had talked to police, fire or other people. Number one concern is delivery of service in case of construction. At least it shows that they're aware of our stakeholders and I gave them a moderate score.

Last page. Mr. Aiazzi, we'll start with you.

MR. AIAZZI: Actually, since I just came up, one of the things I should think about now, when it talks about how they understand the requirements and relationships with NDOT and the ^federal ^ fed rules, which you just pointed out, I wasn't kidding when I said that. If they're putting that in here, and they don't understand that is part of the federal requirements, then that's something I have to take into consideration.

So I actually think that the project's specific conditions that they have only being one page long, and they talked about this, I gave them very low marks here. Again, I believe they know some of them, but they didn't spell them out in this document. So I don't know how we would take it to the next level selecting them saying okay now I want to flesh out this portion. There's not even a bone here to flesh out.

MS. DOYLE: Dan.

MR. EDGINGTON: I have to agree with Mr. Aiazzi. There's just really not enough input here. There's one page and half of that is a chart. I'd like to have seen more specific conditions put in here maybe some of their solutions to the problems we're going to have with some of these conditions.

MR. ROUNDTREE: Well, in the chart they indicate key members of their staff and what they have done, you know, reviewed various documents, met with various people, gone on site inspections, but there's nothing in here to indicate what they learned from those various activities. So based on this, you would say there is no specific project knowledge, because they haven't indicated any.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Yeah, probably just echo a lot of the comments that have already been said. I think essentially there's not a lot of foot work, obviously, have been done on this project, specifically, in preparing the proposal.

MR. RIGDON: Like Dave said, I was -- we know this because company because they are local and so I was probably reading more into here than was actually here, because I do know them. And so I actually gave them a little bit higher score, because I know they've worked with the city, the FHWA and NDOT and these different players, even though it's not necessarily on this one-page, little summary here. So I may be revising that one, because I don't -- I think it does say here, they have to demonstrate in the proposal that they've done that and I'm not sure that the proposal has really demonstrated that. I'll probably end up revising that based upon the comments here.

MS. DOYLE: Steve?

MR. VARELA: I don't have anything more to add.

MR. HOVANICK: Likewise, I have nothing new to add.

MS. DOYLE: Ditto. We are done.

Okay, legal staff. We have finished evaluating verbally one through four. What would you like us to do now? Isn't this good, you get to boss us around.

MR. BOOCK: First of all congratulations on getting through item seven. I think there was some very good discussion here today.

Item eight, what we are intending to do with item eight is talk about the process and procedures for the interviews that will be with the short listed teams on June 6th.

And we're not going to be deciding who are going to be those interview teams. That's when we do the tabulation, but just relate the process. You have a lot of different options and it is entirely up to the committee how they want to do it. There's no federal or state, you know, rule, per se, is you have to do it in this particular fashion.

A couple of different models, which we frequently see for interviews, oral presentations, are the following: Giving the short listed teams a certain period of time to give a presentation, following that up with Q and A from the committee. You can cut them loose and say you're going to speak for 30 minutes, presenting, and then we'll have 30 minutes of Q and A and that's it. Don't give them any further information.

You can ask that they address a couple of specific items in their oral presentation in particular or not as to Q and A. You can give them some written questions in advance and please be prepared to address these, or it can be off-the-cuff questions.

You may want to approach Q and A either by a set of generic questions you ask each of the interviewers -- I mean interview teams, plus some specific ones tailored to their proposal or they can be all generic and, you know asked to all of them.

So a lot of discretion, a lot of different models, but usually they fall into some variation of these models that I just brought up.

MS. DOYLE: I have a question, Corey, since there is lunch waiting in room 211 should we take a break and let each member of the committee kind of think what they would like to see and bring it back to the table in, let's say, 15 minutes.

MR. VARELA: If you don't mind, I'd like to discuss it. I think we can get through it pretty quick. I have some significant background on this.

MS. DOYLE: No, really.

MR. VARELA: I would like to suggest, especially since they have the proposals are all out in the audience, they've had an opportunity to hear the discussion up here, they pretty much know if they selected for the short list, what they're going to want to emphasis. They probably would leave it up to them, let them do a presentation. Maybe we could establish a time for that presentation, then we have the questions or answers that go along after it.

MR. AIAZZI: How much time do you think?

MR. VARELA: This is a big project. A lot of stuff to consider. I think we want to give them more time than I typically would be used to on this. I'm talking much more than a half an hour, probably 45 minutes to an hour for a presentation, which is actually ^40allot ^ a lot longer than they normally would see in a presentation.

MR. ROUNDTREE: I think an hour for the presentation.

MR. RIGDON: Thirty minutes Q and A.

MR. AIAZZI: I have a question on the 30 minutes Q and A. I personally think that maybe that should be open-ended, because if I, although I might mark somebody down, I might ask one question that takes 27 minutes to answer and nobody else gets to that. I think until we run out of questions, this is an important thing.

MR. VARELA: We might want to block out a couple hours for each and at least give them an hour at the end and let them know they have an hour for the answers to the questions.

MR. HOVANICK: Combined total, an hour for the presentation, an hour for the questions or something, you know, how they want to -- .

MR. RIGDON: Even if we don't ask them an hour worth of question, just block that out.

MR. HOVANICK: Block that out for each one. I think the process is good.

MR. BOOCK: One thing I just might point out is in terms of how they are going to be rolled out here, the teams will be sequestered during the interview process, because this is, again, a public session. The idea to not have other teams listening to other teams' interviews while they're going on and getting a competitive advantage.

They will be sequestered during that time. You also will have three or four teams, so just be cognizant when you're adding your hours here what your day is going to be.

There also will be, after the interviews, a discussion session much like this. And because everything will be orally done, I might suggest that you have your group discussion about the interview after each one, so you don't get to the end and forget what you heard five hours earlier from the first team.

So, again, in terms of time, and how much time you want to expend, be cognizant that you're talking probably most of the day for this.

MS. DOYLE: Our next meeting is June 6th, right, and we already have it tentatively it scheduled for 9:00 to 5:00.

MR. VARELA: So we have enough time for the two hour block and the discussion.

MR. AIAZZI: I'd like ask another question about the next step from what we did today. We turn in our score sheets and it goes to the Chairperson and she tallies it up and makes a determination on her own as to whether there will be -- .

MS. DOYLE: No, with staff.

MR. AIAZZI: But how many that's going to be. And I'm wondering if we as a committee want to sort of give some guidelines. Let's say there was a break of 25 points between, you know, some presenters that might be the guideline for that person to cut that off, so it's not -- this is where it's going to be. Quite frankly, what I heard here, it looks like there's two finalists. The question I have: Do we have to have three?

MR. BOOCK: The RFP does say three teams. Whether you go from three to four, the idea is if there is not a big break between three and four, if it's de minimis, that the Chairperson has discretion. The Chairperson, even if it's de minimis, can just cut it off at three. But the idea is if you may want to have the fourth team if it's a de minimis situation.

MS. DOYLE: Going back to the meeting of the 6th, Councilman Aiazzi, Councilman Rigdon, do you want to have written questions or do you just want to do like we normally do at council, just whatever comes to mind a write them down and ask. Mr. Edgington?

MR. AIAZZI: What we've done in the past and what we might consider is if there's a question you want to have asked of all the presenters, you can just forward them on to the Chairperson, and then she makes sure everyone gets asked those same questions. And then we can ask different questions. Just try to be consistent in that manner. But if there's something you want to be sure and ask, I don't mind either way, if you want to bring them here. But if there's something that feel is important that all of the presenters have to answer that question, submit them to her, and she'll make sure the all get asked.

MR. VARELA: That sounds good to me.

MR. RIGDON: But we still want to leave it open, because I want to ask specific questions based upon a proposal.

MS. DOYLE: Still have --.

MR. VARELA: It's good ahead of time -- .

MR. AIAZZI: If there's questions ahead of time, do we want to give it to presenters before then?

MR. RIGDON: No.

MR. AIAZZI: Okay. Just want to ask. I agree with you.

MR. RIGDON: So I have a follow-up to what Dave was asking, though. We've got to have three come through and at least when I was doing the rankings, you know, things did group a little bit. I'm wondering if we just, is it possible for us to decide now that we're just going take it all four to the next level. I mean, we anticipated that we would have maybe eight or nine applications and narrow it down to three. We've got four. I don't know. I mean, I don't even know if it's even proper to discuss that here.

MR. BOOCK: What the RFP says, which is our constitution, so to speak, is there would be three teams, unless there's a de minimis differentiation between three and four and then the Chairperson has discretion.

One, again, there is some discretion in there and I think it is except for the group to offer their thoughts on that to the Chairperson, but it's ultimately going to be her call. One thing to keep in mind here is that if there is a big break between one and then everyone else or two and everyone else, you may not want to go to the fourth, because even if three and

four are real close, because there's a break in the score, and we said we'll take three, but, again, you have discretion there.

MR. RIGDON: What would happen if somebody, based upon what they heard today dropped out between now then? Would we automatically take the next person then? We would have to have three, and that was my -- that was the concern I was thinking about here at the table was if we just automatically took four, if one dropped out we're still cool, we have three in there.

MR. BOOCK: If one dropped out, then the committee could at that time decide to invite the fourth, take the fourth team to the interview. But that's typically not something that would be decided.

MR. RIGDON: I guess what I'm asking if one dropped out, would that put a monkey wrench in the whole process?

MR. BOOCK: No. I mean, if you are not -- the RFP says three get invited. If two of them dropped out and you only had one at the interview stage, you still have a valid committee.

MR. RIGDON: Okay. Then I don't have a concern.

MS. DOYLE: Any other questions, Steve?

MR. MONTGOMERY: I want to raise a concern about, if we did go to the choosing of, including all four or move all four forward in the oral interview process, I wanted to point out that there's an extensive amount of money spent on these proposals. And if there's -- every intent here is some of the committee members don't feel comfortable with one, two or any of the firms here, there's no intention for make them the successful consultant. That there's a lot of money being spent on their behalf. And so maybe it would be fair to the consultant community to maybe make that cut at this point in advance of them going to the oral interviews and letting them up front that there's no opportunity for them getting the work anyway.

MR. BOOCK: What I might point out with that is, again, because of the public nature of these proceedings, the teams are going to know their rankings and their scoring with respect to what you will be doing, what you have done. So it's really -- it should get, typically, it will be their assessment, maybe, if there is a break between two and then three and four, then maybe three and four decide they don't want to proceed further. That's their decision to make.

MR. VARELA: What I was going to say is precisely that. They'll know whether or not they feel comfortable or if they have a chance or not. And we can't prejudge whether they're going to have a chance or not, because we haven't done the second phase of this interview process. So I don't think we should even go there.

MS. DOYLE: What I would like from this committee, since we already seem to have the ground rules set for the meeting on the 6th, what I would like from this committee between now and I would say next Tuesday, is some input from you, maybe do it now, is what would you like to do when we're -- staff and I are doing the rankings? Do you want me to notify if one drops out, if one is below the other three.

MR. VARELA: I don't think we need to worry about one dropping out.

MS. DOYLE: How about just scores? I want permission from this committee -- .

MR. VARELA: To make the decision.

MS. DOYLE: -- To make that decision.

MR. VARELA: De minimis score. That's fine with me. I would give you guidelines, if you want is if they're within -- the score is a 100 percent. You've got a 100 percent, divide by ten, if the third and fourth are within five percent, maybe you consider that's de minimis. That's probably a de minimis, because if you look at the probability scores and everything, you know, that's probably close enough that they're the same in this regard.

MR. RIGDON: I'm comfortable with how we're going forward now that I got. I was just worried that people might drop out. But the -- all I would like to do is as soon as those scores are compiled, have those released to all the committee members so we can see them before the interviews.

MR. VARELA: In fact, we can have the transcripts of our discussion to anyone, if anyone wanted that.

MR. HOVANICK: I would love to have a transcript.

MS. DOYLE: I take it I have committee's approval? Would you like a make a motion, Mr. Rigdon?

MR. RIGDON: A motion to what?

MS. BELAUSTEGUI-TRAFICANTI: Just a couple of comments. The score sheets and the transcript will be posted on our website and also a reminder that your score sheets need to be turned into your Chairwoman by 4:30 p.m. today.

MS. DOYLE: So what I would like is a motion for the turning in of the score sheets and the three and four and all that stuff.

MR. RIGDON: Turn them in at 4:30, she said.

MS. DOYLE: No. What Steve was saying if there's a discrepancy of the five percent, then --.

MR. VARELA: It's just guides to you. You're the Chairperson, you can make the decision if you think that's de minimis or not.

MR. AIAZZI: What do you think is de minimis?

MS. DOYLE: Five percent.

MR. AIAZZI: Five percent.

MR. VARELA: I mean just looking over this, five percent is essentially the same when you're looking at this, because all of us scored differently. Because you're not going to get. It's just a thought. I mean, it could be ^ten ^ 10, I mean, even with this, with the possible discrepancies in scores.

MR. RIGDON: Explain this to me one more time, then.

MR. VARELA: When we refer to de minimis, that means that the third and fourth place proposal is so close that you can't really determine which one is ahead of the next. And with regards to the way we're scoring, I would -- .

MR. RIGDON: Oh, you're saying if the third and fourth place are within five percent.

MR. VARELA: Let's say one guy gets 50, the other gets 55, they're essentially tied. They're both going to the oral interview.

MR. RIGDON: That works for me.

MS. DOYLE: That's what I need the motion on so you can say that you give me that discretion.

MR. RIGDON: So moved.

MR. AIAZZI: Second.

MS. DOYLE: Discussion?

All in favor.

MS. DOYLE: Any other discussion, thoughts, comments?

MR. HOVANICK: I had a comment and I think Todd maybe touched on this, but I think we really as a committee should thank all these proposers for the time and effort and cost for putting these substantial proposals together. I know it's a big deal and they've done a great job and it's given us a chance to see what's out there and make some decisions on it. So I'd like to personally thank them for doing that.

MR. RIGDON: I would echo that. I do have one comment I wanted to make, too, was for the agenda next time, there was some concern, I know from some people, that the agenda didn't say anywhere on it that this was for the ReTRAC project. And so the title at the top would say that this has to do with ReTRAC or something along those lines.

MR. VARELA: Actually, I thought that was corrected.

MS. DOYLE: It was.

MR. RIGDON: It was corrected? Okay. Because I guess I got the old agenda.

MR. VARELA: You got the old one.

MR. RIGDON: Okay. And so that was all and because we do have, I think it would be great if we could get more public here to actually see these guys and their qualifications and what we're choosing between.

MR. VARELA: We did a press release also.

MR. EDGINGTON: I have two questions. If I'm going to bring this back to you today, where will I find you at? Where will I deliver it to?

MS. DOYLE: City Manager's Office.

MR. EDGINGTON: And questions we're going to write to give to you, when would you like to have those?

MS. DOYLE: Preferably before June 6th.

MR. EDGINGTON: Do you want it next Monday or Tuesday, that's what I'm getting at.

MS. DOYLE: If you could have them to me the 4th, which is my birthday and the 6th is Emily's birthday, she'll be five, and guess what I'm doing.

But the easiest way is to e-mail. That way I can forward the other members of the committee.

I would like to also, I would say on behalf of the city, I would like to thank our proposers for spending the time and doing all this.

And I would like to thank members of this committee for being here and doing this in a timely fashion. They thought we'd be here until midnight. And we will see you on the 6th. I'd like to thank legal staff.

MR. AIAZZI: Motion to adjourn.

MR. RIGDON: Second.

MS. DOYLE: All in favor?